3938.aaa.32

# REMARKS

ON THE

# WRITINGS

OF THE

## Rev. JOSEPH BERINGTON.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS AND SIX PENCE.

## ERRATA.

Page 6 line 13 ἔθα read ἔΦα.
7 23 fpread r. ſpread.
8 27 *where* r. *when*.
25 20 controverſial r. controvertiſtical.
26 2 8 r. 10.
Ibid. 8 *repreſent* r. *repreſents*.
71 6 *Quid ſibi vult ſeminiverbius iſte?* read *Quid vult ſeminibervius hic dicere?*
75 26 humiliating r. humbling.
78 2 above that r. above to that.

# REMARKS

ON THE

# *WRITINGS*

OF THE

REV. JOSEPH BERINGTON,

ADDRESSED TO THE

## Catholic Clergy of England,

BY THE

*Rev. Charles Plowden.*

*In ſugillationem doctorum eccleſiæ magnis effert laudibus philoſophos: adinventiones illorum & ſuas novitates catholicorum patrum doctrinæ præfert et fidei: et cum omnes fugiant a facie ejus, me omnium minimum expetit ad ſingulare certamen.*

S. Bernard in ep. ad Papam Innocent. de error. P. Abailardi.

LONDON:

Printed by Js P. COGHLAN, No. 37. Duke-Street, Groſvenor-Square: And ſold by Meſſrs. J. DEBRETT oppoſite Burlington-Houſe, Piccadilly; BOOKER Bond-Street; KEATING, Warwick-Street; LEWIS, Ruſſel-Street; and ROBINSONS, Pater-noſter Row.

M DCC XCII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

# INTRODUCTION.

IN offering theſe Remarks to the reverend gentlemen of the Roman catholic clergy, it is proper to give ſome account of their origin, and of the occaſion, which now calls them into light. It is well remembered, that on June 9, 1791, the R. Joſeph Berington, ſupported by twelve gentlemen of our clergy, pledged himſelf in a public meeting to oppoſe our ſenior prelate, on a point of eccleſiaſtical government, in which he had judged it neceſſary to exert his ſpiritual authority. Soon after, I took an opportunity to blame the indiſcretion of this unprovoked hoſtility; I ex-

I expoſed the weakneſs of the grounds on which it reſted, and unfortunately the mentioned gentlemen conceived themſelves ſorely injured by the cenſure. Forgetting that public conduct is always liable to public animadverſion, they pronounced the reaſonings advanced againſt them to be ſcandalous; and as if nobody elſe could do any miſchief, they were pleaſed to turn general blame into perſonal reproof, and to aſſume entirely to themſelves the cenſure, which I had levelled againſt a few nameleſs innovators of our religion and diſcipline, from whom however they were carefully diſcriminated. Their public conduct on June 9, 1791, was the object of my cenſure, and though I lamented their misfortune in being miſled by the unſound principles of a few, I was far from giving them the importance of ringleaders or adviſers of the miſchiefs, which, I conceived, thoſe few men had occaſioned. I was aſtoniſhed

that

that they would aſſume it, and I could attribute their conduct only to miſapprehenſion of plain language; I did not impute it to the conſciouſneſs of ſelf-conviction. They demanded a reparation of an imaginary injury, they demanded it in their *collective capacity*, and this circumſtance rendered an anſwer impoſſible. They had indeed aſſumed this quality in the meeting of June 9, but I knew not how to reſpect it. I had been taught, that no determinate number of clergymen can conſtitute a body, unleſs they are acknowledged in that capacity by their biſhop, and are governed by a ſuperior duly appointed and authoriſed. With ſuch a ſuperior I would willingly have correſponded, but I could not hold intercourſe with clergymen, who aſcribed to themſelves a collective capacity, which did not belong to them. To correſpond with them *collectively*, would have been to countenance what to me appeared an

infringe-

infringement of diſcipline; they were not a *body*, I could conſider them only as a clerical club, and while ſuch aſſociations are unauthoriſed by biſhops, there will be reaſon to dread the dangers, which may eventually reſult from them to the common intereſts of our religion.

Amidſt the vociferations of this club, the ſhrieks of the R. Joſeph Berington were the moſt piercing, harſh and diſſonant. Long habituated to diſtinction, he even here arrogated to himſelf the pre-eminence of blame, and with all the foreneſs of authorſhip, he fancied his own works malignantly alluded to, he felt his opinions qneſtioned, his doctrines arraigned, he diſcovered in my publication aſſertions that were never aſſerted, meanings that were never meant. His expoſtulations were left unanſwered. They had however the effect to excite my curioſity. At that period I was almoſt equally unacquaint-

ed

ed with Mr. Berington's perſon and writings; for excepting two tracts, which I had once haſtily peruſed at their firſt appearance many years ago, I had never read a page in any of his works. I reſolved to allot ſome winter evenings to the peruſal of ſome of his writings, which I could borrow in my neighbourhood, and the following Remarks are the reſult of my reading.

They would have remained in my deſk, if a late addreſs of Mr. Berington and his confederates, inviting the clergy to *reſiſt* their ſenior biſhop, had not ſuggeſted the idea of ſpreading them. The virtuous and learned gentlemen, to whom this addreſs is directed, want not my remarks, to form their judgment on its intrinſic merit. I mean not to inſtruct them; but then I conſider, that it is important to underſtand the character and principles of a man, who would engage us in a deed of the utmoſt magnitude, and probably many of

my clerical brethren are this day as ignorant of the doctrines and principles of the Reverend Joseph Berington, as I was four months ago. Contempt of lawful authority is the great evil of the times; we have long been accustomed to consider that of bishops as essential to our religion, and when we are seriously invited to *resist* it with fashionable appeals and protestations, we must naturally desire every possible information to assist us in judging of the case. The principles and avowed doctrines of the Reverend Joseph Berington are here presented to the catholic clergy, as a term of comparison, by which they may form their judgment on the important measure recommended in the Staffordshire address; and it is conceived, that it cannot be adopted, without admitting at least some of those principles in all their latitude. I have not been able to find all the writings of Mr. Berington; but the few which I have

borrowed,

borrowed, are ſo pregnant with matter, ſo deſcriptive of the author, that they may be ſaid to hold forth an original portrait, of which, his other works can be but copies- They might perhaps exhi it a few finiſhing traits, ſome additional glow of colouring; but they will be needleſs for whoever poſſeſſes the prominent features, which characterize the man, and theſe are ſtrongly marked on the pages, which I am going to review. Affectation of ſingularity, fondneſs for novel opinions, contempt for the depoſitaries of ſpiritual authority, ſelf-preference and diſdain of his equals are the characteriſtics of Mr. Berington's writings, and they have betrayed him into endleſs errors on the ſubject of religion, which, of all others, allows the leaſt ſcope to the rovings of fancy. A writer of this caſt cannot be deeply ſtudied in theology, which ever tends to bridle the imagination, in proportion as it enlightens

the

the understanding, and expands the heart. When known Mr. Berington will not make proselytes among clergymen, virtuous and intelligent as ours are; and surely nothing but the unsubstantial flash of supposed superiority could have dazzled a few of his nearest neighbours, who stand too close to the object, to be able to judge of its due proportions, or even to distinguish its shape and colours. My aim is, to remove it to a competent distance, where its natural shape may be more easily discerned, and compared with the genuine image of a catholic doctor, which each of those gentlemen may view, when he pleases, reflected from his own mind. Mr. Berington, says a late publication, *as a writer, has been long before the public, and to that public he has intrusted his reputation.* (Appeal to &c.) I envy him not any which his works can deserve, and as he has made the appeal to them, he will not deny me the

the liberty of delivering my opinion of them. The method, which I ſhall follow, is unexceptionable, being the very ſame, that he has adopted in the laſt mentioned work.

REMARKS

# REMARKS

ON THE

# WRITINGS

OF THE

## Rev. JOSEPH BERINGTON.

*The State and Behaviour of Engliſh Catholics from the Reformation to the Year* 1780.---*London, by R. Faulder, New Bond Street,* 1780.

PAGE vi. of the preface.—*I am no Papiſt, nor is my religion Popery. The one and the other have no proper exiſtence, but in the miſrepreſentations of our adverſaries: ſomething of them may perhaps be found in the kingdoms of Italy, Spain and Portugal.*—I mean not here to enquire into the legal or the vulgar acceptation of the words *Papiſt* and *Popery*, which Mr.

Berington would have done well to explain in this place. I only aſk, how a thing can be found in Italy, Spain and Portugal, which has *no proper exiſtence?* It might be proved, that there are many papiſts and much popery in thoſe kingdoms.

P. 2, 3, 4.—Theſe pages exhibit a ſtrange confuſion in accounting for the motives, which influenced the *Proteſtant aſſociation* in 1780. The author firſt allows their motives to have been *cogent and weighty*; preſently after he finds it *rational to conclude, that they had no diſtinct object before them:* next *he does not pretend to ſay what their views were:* a few lines after *he is much diſpoſed to believe that it was the dread alone of popery* (which has no proper exiſtence) *that inſtigated them.* There is no information in all this, and it characteriſes the writer; but it is a trifle.

P. 14.—*Catholics are to be conſidered as a ſect diſſenting from the national church.* It is impoſſible that Catholics ſhould ever conſider themſelves as *ſectaries* or *diſſenters* in religion. Theſe words can deſcribe thoſe perſons only, who break the unity of faith by diſſenting from Catholics. With reaſon did the Engliſh Catholics reject one of theſe denominations, when it was propoſed to them in 1789. I do

not

not ſay that it was then ſuggeſted by Mr. Berington, but it may have been copied from this paſſage.

P. 38.—*They* (the Catholics, who refuſed the oath of James I.) *were diſturbed with difficulties, which at this day make no impreſſion.* This aſſertion is unfounded. It is alſo injurious to our anceſtors, and to us, who ſtill feel the force of the reaſons which actuated them. How could Mr. Berington in 1780 undertake to anſwer for the ſentiments of all his brethren on this momentous point? The years 1790 and 1791 may have undeceived him. With what aſſurance does he *(ibid.)* judge of the duties of the ſovereign pontiff, and pronounce his interference in the buſineſs of that oath *inopportune!* He complains that this interference *fruſtrated a ſcheme, the ſucceſs of which, delicacy of conſcience alone had at firſt obſtructed. (p.* 34.) It would have been a ſcandal, if the Pope's conſcience had been leſs delicate, than that of the Britiſh Catholics; and is it not ſcandalous in a prieſt to revile a Pope and the body of our Catholic anceſtors, for having acted, in a weighty concern, on the happy principle of delicacy of conſcience? He imputes a worſe motive to the Pope, but it is a calumny, which he does not even attempt to

prove. The Pope was not then ſtruggling for *ſuppoſed prerogative*, he was fulfilling his ſtricteſt duty of guarding his flock from error.

P. 43.—*I am not aſhamed to ſay, that the government which is beſt inclined to give us protection, has the only right to demand our allegiance.* I am aſhamed to copy ſuch a ſentence. The verſatility of allegiance, which Mr. Berington's principle ſuppoſes, is perfectly inconſiſtent with our Catholic maxims of ſubordination to civil power. The ſettled and acknowledged government of our country has always a right to demand our allegiance, and we are conſcientiouſly bound to yield it, though we ſhould know, that a Pretender, by eſtabliſhing a new government, would give us more efficacious protection. In vain would foreign enemies or pretenders hold out flattering proſpects to us. As long as we remain attached to our genuine principles, we ſhall equally difregard their promiſes and Mr. Berington's new doctrine on the obligations of civil allegiance. It is remarkable, that he addreſſed it to his brethren, only two years after they had pledged their fidelity to the preſent government by a ſolemn oath, and in a ſeaſon of public danger, while the combined fleets of Spain and France were hovering on our coaſts and threatening an invaſion.

P. 46,

P. 46, 47.—What an unſatisfactory account Mr. Berington here gives of the negociations for relieving Catholics in the reign of Charles II.! He repreſents the gentry as indifferent about the lives of their prieſts, and the prieſts as equally careleſs about the removal of the penal laws, becauſe they afforded them a chance of martyrdom. Is this writing hiſtory? He imputes the ferment which prevailed againſt Catholics, and afterwards burſt forth in Oates's plot, to the *imprudence of ſome Catholics and the inſolence of others*, (p. 47.) Other writers have aſſigned very different cauſes for this event. It is at leaſt *imprudent*, if it be not *inſolent*, in Mr. Berington, to alledge theſe two, without bringing forward a ſingle fact to prove them.

P. 51.—*But this deſign*, (of King Charles to relieve Catholics) *from the perverſe oppoſition of ſome weak heads of the party, vaniſhed as ſoon as it was diſcovered. Moderate men in their conferences with the king, often complained of the folly and vanity of ſome of their friends, and more particularly of the preſumption of the Jeſuits.* Who were theſe weak men? What oppoſition did they make? In what did the perverſeneſs of it conſiſt? What were their deeds which ſhewed folly and vanity? What

acts

acts of presumption did the Jesuits commit? Who were these Jesuits? Till these questions are answered, I will not believe a writer who *presumes* to tell me upon his own credit, without proof, that a few *perverse, weak, foolish, vain* and *presumptuous* men could at once defeat a great project of a monarch, planned for the relief of a large body of his subjects, and cause it to *vanish*, as soon as it was known. What an historian is Mr. Berington! P. 52. contains another string of harsh imputations against these men, unsupported even by the shadow of a proof. ἀνὴρ ἔθα.

P. 57.—*These connexions with France were of the most fatal tendency, and the royal brothers, with all their ministers, deserved to lose their heads.* In p. 55, Mr. Berington had blamed the Duke of York for being *far too open in declaring his religious sentiments.* I would rather give him credit for his candour, and conclude, that he was too honest a man to venture upon practical hypocrisy. But why is the Duke of York here condemned to the block, when the king his brother alone made the treaty with France? Catholics were wrongfully accused in Charles' reign, of a design to murder their sovereign; but no English Catholic, either in that reign, or in any other period, till 1780, ever

ever broached such dangerous doctrine, as is here delivered by a priest. In our happy constitution the king can do no wrong, and the forming of political connexions with foreign powers, is an undoubted part of his prerogative. For this does Mr. Berington condemn the king, the heir to the throne, and all the ministry to be beheaded. We have already seen his principle of allegiance; but what idea shall we here form of his respect for royal authority? His frequent sallies against the Pope do not equal this. Though I had slightly perused the *State and Behaviour of English Catholics* eleven years ago, I declare that I had not noticed or had utterly forgotten this passage, when, during last summer, I wrote, "that the worst of Republicans are innovating priests."

P. 66.—*Coleman*, (secretary to the Duke of York) *was a weak and bigoted man, who wished to give a spread to his religion, but that only by procuring a free toleration for Catholics.* Is a wish to spread catholic religion a mark of weakness and bigotry? Is it decent in a catholic priest to say so? Mr. Berington has publicly professed his wish to *procure free toleration for Catholics*, as much as Mr. Coleman. Mr. Berington is neither *weak* nor *bigoted*, and

of

of courſe does not wiſh *to give a ſpread to his religion.* What then is his motive to wiſh for *free toleration?* *Toleration* is a pretty word in the mouth of modern authors, and the French National Aſſembly has explained the true meaning of it. It conſiſts in encouraging all ſects and the negation of all ſects, and in depreſſing the old catholic chriſtian flock. The endeavours of James II. to procure *toleration and liberty of conſcience* for his catholic ſubjects, are taxed with *folly* by Mr. Berington, (p. 72); and (p. 73) he aſſerts, *that James' diſpenſing with the laws againſt Catholics, broke aſunder that ſacred compact, by which the people are bound to their ſovereign.* Mr. Berington had yet to learn, that the power of diſpenſing occaſionally with the laws, had been practiſed by our ſovereigns in every age, and therefore probably conſtituted a part of the prerogative, till the new ſettlement was made at the Revolution. It was then withdrawn from the prerogative. Mr. Berington's account of James II.'s reign proves that, when catholic religion is concerned, his zeal for unbounded toleration can admit a partial check. From his ſpite againſt this unfortunate prince he ſtrains out a general maxim, and informs us (ibid.) that, *where kings violate the laws, (it matters not under what*

*pretence)*

*pretence) they become tyrants.* I wiſh the author of this ſentence were not a prieſt. Do ſubjects then, by violating the laws, become rebels? Fie Mr. Berington, ſuch language is grating to our ears, habituated to the ſofter accents of our biſhops and inſtructors, "Harbour not a thought injurious to thy prince, "for the king can do no wrong." *In cogitatione tua regi non detrahas.* Eccleſ. x. 20.

P. 90.—In ſpeaking of the project ſet on foot for the relief of Catholics in the reign of George I. Mr. Berington ſays, *there was a narrowneſs in the minds of Catholics, laity as well as clergy, which little leſs than miraculous powers could have enlarged.* The arrogance of this aſſertion is perfectly congenial to our author's mind, which the expected miracle has ſo wonderfully expanded. As his enlarged mind undoubtedly contains the hiſtory of that tranſaction, why would he not ſubmit to inform his *narrow-minded* brethren, of the propoſals which the negociators made, and of the reaſons for which they were rejected? All that he vouchſafes to tell them, is, that *the Committee of Catholics diſagreed, the affair ſunk, and was no more heard of.* Is this enough for the preſent generation, on which he owns (ibid.) that *theſe miraculous powers have begun to operate?* One

of the brighteſt miracles of this age, is a marked reluctance to ſubmit to authority, even when grounded on miracles. How then can we implicitly believe the word, even of Mr. Berington, ungarniſhed by proofs either from reaſon or from fact? There was however, it ſeems, one miraculous man in that age, Dr. Strickland, (ibid.) but not Moſes himſelf with all his miracles could ſubdue the ſtupid obſtinacy of Pharaoh and his Egyptians. Whatever the propoſals were, our *narrow-minded* biſhops, peers, prieſts and gentry, in George I.'s reign, certainly refuſed them, as dangerous to catholic tenets, partial in their nature, and apt to create diviſions. From that inauſpicious day a ceſſation of *miracles* enſued, no more prophets were ſent to enlighten us till the year 1780. What a blaze of light has illuminated us ſince that date!

P. 97.—*The bigotry and narrow fancies of former days ſeemed melted down into extenſive philanthropy, and a mild indulgence even to the errors of our fellow-creatures.* The light begins to dawn: Mr. Berington is a man of ſcience, and he here preſents us with the chymical compoſition of *philanthropy*. It conſiſts of melted bigotry, mixed with narrow fancies, alſo in a ſtate of fuſion, and its effect is, to engender

gender indulgence to error. The quantity of bigotry and narrow fancies which has been melted down ſince the year 1780, muſt leave but few ingredients, to make philanthropy for the next generation. Even at preſent, a few ancient men, of yet unmelted bigotry, give it as their opinion, that in ſpite of the pretenſions of our *men of miracles*, real philanthropy is already become very rare. Mr. Berington has not enough of it to ſhew any *indulgence to the errors of his fellow-creatures*, who lived under George I. and we ſhall ſoon ſee how much he can ſpare for the miſtakes of his brethren, who live under George III.

P. 101.—Mr. Berington thinks the oath of 1778 *ſufficiently humiliating*, probably to cure us of that *imprudence, inſolence, preſumption* and *narrowneſs of mind*, which defeated every other project for our relief in the days of Charles II. and George I. Why then would Mr. Berington add to our humiliation, by approving and recommending the oath of the year 1790, which would have robbed us even of our name, and have *humiliated* us into diſſenters?

P. 119.—*The Pope indeed has riches: but it is not uſual with the See of Rome to beſtow her earthly commodities; ſhe receives, but does not give.* The Pope at preſent enjoys a very li-

mited and ſtill decreaſing revenue. The eleemoſynary expenditure of the court of Rome however has not been much retrenched. The holy See at this day expends large annual ſums in charitable and religious uſes, in the four quarters of the globe. When Popes were richer, their bounties were greater. In the laſt century Alexander VII. gratuitouſly furniſhed large ſubſidies to the Venetians in their Turkiſh war. I have read, that Gregory XIII. ſpent above twelve hundred thouſand golden crowns, chiefly in religious eſtabliſhments. From the benefactions of the two Popes here mentioned, is derived the foundation, on which Mr. Berington was gratuitouſly educated at Douay. *Filios enutrivi—ipſi ſpreverunt me.* I beg pardon for citing the words in the plural; for among the many Engliſh prieſts, who owe their education to the bounty of the holy See, Mr. Berington ſtands forth a ſingle inſtance of unprovoked ingratitude.

P. 140.—In this page Mr. Berington blames the catholic church *for having often denied the external practice of religion to ſectaries.* If this be a crime, it ought to be laid to the account of the civil, rather than of the eccleſiaſtical power. But one remark is here obvious

obvious. Among the various religions, which divide mankind, the catholic church is the only one which pronounces herſelf excluſively poſſeſſed of divine truth. She is therefore at leaſt conſiſtent, if ſhe denies to ſectaries the external practice of their religions. Hence, in catholic countries, this liberty has been ſeldom granted, and, as far as the church is concerned, it probably will not be promiſcuouſly allowed, unleſs where external motives of juſtice, order, or public peace may intervene. In other religions, where no claim to infallibility is advanced, a refuſal of general toleration muſt appear inconſiſtent, unleſs when reaſons of ſtate authoriſe and recommend exceptions. In catholic principles Chriſt could make but one church-eſtabliſhment. Mr. Berington places the churches eſtabliſhed by different ſectaries, on the ſame level with the catholic church of Chriſt, and he moſt intolerantly blames them all alike for intolerance. He continually returns to this ſubject, but he never diſtinguiſhes between civil toleration of diſſenters in religion, and an indiſcriminate permiſſion to profeſs and teach all kinds of error. His doctrine equaliſes all modes of religion, and levels all diſtinctions. It is in fact

fact Latitudinarianiſm. *Magnam ſibi videtur aſſumpſiſſe religionem, quia nullam reſpuit falſitatem.* S. Leo. We ſhall meet again on this topic, and in reaſoning upon it, I ſhall endeavour to keep in view the great principle of catholic unity, which Mr. Berington ſeems to have forgotten, or perhaps never to have underſtood.

P. 148.—What idea has Mr. Berington of the indiviſible unity of faith, who thinks that the catholic church is *divided only by a very thin partition* from the proteſtant church of England? Alas, in how few articles do they agree! While Proteſtants reject but a ſingle article, however trifling Mr. Berington may think it, they cannot poſſibly coaleſce with the catholic church. Mr. Berington may proſecute the ſcheme of Dupin, and he will give us additional proofs, that in religious principles, he is not more found than that author. He affects to think that all the difference between us ariſes from *intereſt, party and prejudice*, and theſe miſchiefs he attributes to controvertiſts, whoſe labours he here and p. 162 inſolently contemns, and afterwards (p. 172) fooliſhly commends. In p. 171 and 172 it is allowed, that our prieſts *were very able and well informed*; . . . *true religion has*

*many*

*many obligations to their laborious efforts....They were well ſkilled in the arts of controverſy.* This commendation is given to the ancient prieſts of Douay and the other ſeminaries, becauſe to deny their merit would have been madneſs, and the diſtance of two centuries removes them out of the reach of a direct compariſon with Mr. Berington himſelf. But their modern ſucceſſors, who have purſued the ſame line of ſtudy, muſt be depreſſed, to make room for his own idol. They are *narrow-minded, ill-educated, ſtocked with theological lumber, unfaſhioned and prejudiced, rough and unſociable, ignorant and ſelf-ſufficient.* (P. 162 et alib. paſſim.) Our gentry, and the laity in general, are (p. 129) deſtitute of *education and deficient in native talents; their total inattention to improvement is an inſurmountable bar to the acquiſition of great accompliſhments; they travel abroad like their portmanteaus,* that is, they travel *to kiſs the Pope's ſlipper, and to viſit our Lady at Loretto;* (ibid.) *they are indolent, timid, men of little views; they are proud, ignorant and imperious;* (p. 163) they *are poor, diſſipated, and diſunited;* they are, throughout the book, equally fools and beggars. In the whole catholic community, there is but a ſingle cha-

racter

rather adorned with every natural and acquired accompliſhment, it riſes to view in every page; and who ſhall refuſe the all-perfect Mr. Berington the philanthropic right of debaſing his brethren, when his own glory thereby beams forth the more conſpicuous, to the immortal honour of the whole community?—Who is this Iſmaelite, that reviles the ſons of the houſehold? *Manus ejus contra omnes*; I muſt not add, *et manus omnium contra illum.* However deſpicable Engliſh Catholics may be, in compariſon with Mr. Berington, let him at leaſt allow them the merit of moderation and forbearance. Four thouſand ſuns have ſunk upon theſe inſults, and they have not been yet reſented. *Adverſus fratrem tuum loquebaris, et adverſus filium matris tuæ ponebas ſcandalum; hæc feciſti et tacui.* Pſ. 49. In a more improved ſociety, Mr. Berington would be leſs brilliant. It may be hoped, that this conſideration will withhold him from burſting through *the thin partion*, which yet confines him within the catholic pale.

P. 149.—In what inſtances have catholic divines *ignorantly confounded the inventions of fallible men with the unerring declarations of heaven, and thereby impoſed on their catholic brethren?*

*thren?* Innovators may have done this, but Mr. Berington aſſerts it of catholic divines. If they had done it, they would not have deſerved the name. The catholic creed has in all times been underſtood by divines of the catholic church. Mr. Berington has to ſhew, that they have impoſed upon the public by perſuading them, that private *fallible opinions were unerring declarations of heaven*, that is, he muſt prove, that catholic divines have led the church into error. Where are his proofs? He ſuppoſes that his rejection of theſe opinions of divines would provoke the Pope to *deny him the name of Papiſt*, (p. 150) and the ſuppoſition only proves, that he can inſult the Pope without provocation. He has alſo ſuppoſed (p. 131) that *inſenſibility to the impreſſions of religion* will make a man's conſcience *ſincere* in his reſearches after a new one. Mr. Berington is as unlucky in ſuppoſitions, as he is in aſſertions.

P. 153.—The account of the Pope's power in this and the next page is extracted from the condemed doctrines of Richer and Febronius. Theſe two innovators make the papal power merely miniſterial, dependent on the reſt of the church, as diſtinct from the Pope

himſelf. Mr. Berington moreover aſſimilates it to the Britiſh government, in which there is much talk of prerogative and liberties. The ſpiritual power of the Pope is nothing of all this. In catholic principles, it is derived directly from Jeſus Chriſt, and is not to be controuled by men. The church is nothing without its head, and all general canons, which the Pope is bound to obſerve, exiſt by the Pope's conſent. Can Mr. Berington's aſſertion be conſiſtent with catholic faith, when he ſays, that *each paſtor, biſhop, metropolitan and patriarch, is poſſeſſed of a proper and eſſential juriſdiction, wholly uncontroulable by and independent of the See of Rome?* He dares even to add, that *this order was divinely eſtabliſhed by Chriſt.* As this bold aſſertion is the firſt principle of all Mr. Berington's theology on the ſubject of ſpiritual power, and moreover ſeems to be the ſource, from whence other ſcandalous doctrines have been more recently derived, I mean to reſerve it for the peculiar cognizance and deciſion of Mr. Berington's biſhop, who *is poſſeſſed of a proper and eſſential juriſdiction* to qualify it as it deſerves. Mean time I will believe with Catholics, that, by the divine appointment of

Chriſt

Chriſt, there is no *proper and eſſential juriſdiction* in the church, which is not *properly* and *eſſentially* ſubordinate to that of the Pope, and actually derived from him.

P. 164.—That catholic prieſt muſt ſurely undervalue the divine gift of faith, who thinks that the church *is not benefited by an increaſe of numbers.* Our Redeemer prayed, that we might all become one. Mr. Berington thinks *we are already too many,* becauſe *we ſuffer.* (Ibid.) S. Paul ſaid that ſufferings would diſtinguiſh them, who live piouſly in Chriſt. Mr. Berington thinks we are too numerous, becauſe *we are loſt to the ſervice of our country.* (Ibid.) The apoſtles drew as many as they could to the ſervice of Chriſt, though they knew that their country would reject their ſervices, and even drive them from civil ſociety. *Abſque ſynagogis facient vos.... ejicient vos ....eritis odio omnibus.... perſequentur de civitate in civitatem.* Perhaps theſe ancient maxims and notions may be among the abuſes (p. 154) *which it is our duty, by the moſt effectual means, to reform.* Lovely philanthropy! As Mr. Berington *is poſſeſſed of a proper and eſſential juriſdiction independent of and wholly uncontroulable by the See of Rome,* he may defy the

the Pope and his papiſts to ſtop him in his career of reformation.

P. 167.—Mr. Berington is ever offended at the appearance of religious zeal. He takes care to inform us, that the zeal of the Jeſuits, *though often productive of great good, was ſometimes productive of great evil.* He ſays, the *Jeſuits fell unpitied.* It is not ſo. The compaſſion of the virtuous in every country, and above all, the conſolation which they received from almoſt every biſhop in the catholic church, ſoothed their afflictions and taught them to bear them. The contempt, with which Mr. Berington treats his fellow-collegians and his mother houſe, (p. 173 et alibi) may be conceived by thoſe, who know the workings of diſappointed paſſion, and have heard, that Mr. Berington was *adviſed* to relinquiſh the chair, which he, for the firſt time ſince its eſtabliſhment, had profaned with dangerous novelties. But what malice could prompt him to revile the unoffending Benedictin and Franciſcan Religious? His intended affront to the former is in fact a compliment, by repreſenting them as fit for nothing, but to ſing the praiſes of God. His inſinuation againſt the latter is odiouſly illi-

beral

beral and falſe, when he intimates that theſe reſpectable Religious obtained the earthly ſubſtance of families, by vain promiſes of a place in paradiſe, which they pretended to have at their diſpoſal. Does that man reſpect the ſpiritual powers of miſſionaries, who turns them to mockery, by allotting them to women? (p. 182.) The flippancy of this paſſage bares the light heart of the writer.

REMARKS

# REMARKS

ON

*Reflections addreſſed to the Rev. John Hawkins, by the Rev. Joſeph Berrington.—Birmingham, 1785.*

PAGE vii. of Pref.—If any one ſhould imagine that Mr. Berington has aſſumed more favourable notions of his catholic brethren ſince 1780, he will be here undeceived. Mr. Berington aſſures him in November 1785, *that he has often reconſidered his ſhort view of the State and Behaviour of the Engliſh Catholics, even in detail, and has ſeen reaſon to be ſatisfied with the ſtatement of facts* contained in it. When I read this deciſive confirmation of the work, which I have reviewed, I thought it quite needleſs to ſearch for a ſecond edition of it, which, I have been told, was publiſhed with ſome alterations in the interval between the two mentioned years. The Catholics then in 1785 continued to be

*narrow-*

*narrow-minded, proud, ill-educated, imperious* and *diſſipated*; and yet in this page they are ſuddenly adorned with *virtues of the moſt amiable nature*; they are *honeſt, liberal, generous* and *humane*. Either they change their character like Proteus, or Mr. Berington gives them imaginary virtues, merely for the pleaſure of contradicting himſelf within the ſhort ſpace of nine lines.

P. 2.—*The country* (of controverſy) *was almoſt impracticable, and many of its roads were nearly choked up with rubbiſh.* We have been told (*State and Behav. p.* 171.) that the controvertiſts whom Mr. Berington here boaſts to have read, were *well ſkilled in their art.* Does this character belong to men, who *choke up the way with rubbiſh?* Whence ariſes Mr. Berington's ſpiteful contempt of catholic controvertiſts? He has acknowledged (ibid.) that *true religion has many obligations to their laborious efforts*, and in this page he owns, that the reading of their works (ſo full of rubbiſh) *has confirmed him in his firſt principles.* Turn over the leaf, and you will learn, that Mr. Berington *is no friend to controverſial writing* (to which true religion has ſo many obligations) *that it is not calculated to do good, and much evil it has produced.* (P. 4.)

What

What can this evil be, but the ſervices which it has done to true religion, and the confirming of Mr. Berington in his old principles? That the latter is to be reckoned among the miſchiefs of controverſy, we ſhall have a plain proof in p. 56 and 57, where he will expreſs his *indignation* at theſe books of controverſy, for not eaſing him of the load of *catholic belief, which weighs rather heavy on his mind,* and for not allowing him to *range* uncontrouled in *the freer field,* from which, as we have ſeen, *only a thin partition* divides him. With indignation he throws the book aſide, becauſe, inſtead of *ſetting him at liberty by ſome happy diſcovery, it obliges him to believe what the church propoſes,* and theſe propoſed doctrines *weigh heavy* on his reluctant mind. (Ibid.)

At the period when *the general ſpirit of enquiry had begun to call into life thoſe mental powers, which for whole centuries, had ſlept in lazy indolence, our Engliſh prieſts,* we are told, *eagerly engaged in diſputes of religion.* (*State and Behav. p.* 172.) And why, in the whole circle of ſciences, ſhould religion alone be excluded from the labours of the learned? Thoſe at leaſt, whoſe minds and hearts religion eaſes, conceive it to be the moſt intereſting of all ſciences. Thoſe, on whom it hangs as a

dead

dead weight, and who pant for the liberty of *ranging in freer fields*, have always endeavoured to ſully its purity. Hence the former have, in all ages, refuted the falſe principles and erroneous reaſonings of the latter; and their works, by one ſet of chriſtians are thought to contain the chain of catholic traditions, by another ſet they are thought to be *choked with rubbiſh*. The earlieſt of theſe controvertiſtical writers, whom I find upon record, are St. Paul and St. John, the regular ſucceſſion of them has never failed, and the preſent race of controvertiſts are oppoſing the accumulated knowledge of eighteen centuries againſt the Gallic innovators and their humble followers in this country, who are aiming to break down *thin partitions*, and to *range in freer fields*. Mr. Berington, though a declared foe to controverſial antiquarians in religion, feels ſore when ſuſpected of favouring philoſophical innovators. *Vere et tu ex illis es, nam et loquela tua manifeſtum te facit.*

P. 7.—*Benevolence and philanthropy, though pretty words, are, in fact, but little adapted to the heart of man; he does not exiſt ſuch as the philoſopher, in his wild muſings, repreſents him.*

Then why that honeyed deſcription of ſweet philanthropy *(ſee above, p.* 8.) unleſs to trill upon the ear and to give ſound for ſenſe? Our old unmelted bigots will in the end be right, in denying the exiſtence of philanthropy among the modern illumined doctors. They will readily agree, that *man is not ſuch as the philoſopher in his wild muſings repreſent him,* eſpecially if that philoſopher be Mr. Berington: but they will ſooner write books of controverſy againſt Mr. Berington, than ſurrender to him the virtue of *benevolence,* which they believe to be perfectly *adapted to the human heart.* They think ſo, becauſe they enjoy the peace of Chriſt, and this was brought from heaven for men of benevolence and good will, —*hominibus bonæ voluntatis.*

P. 8.—*I cannot ſay, whether it would be better that this diſcipline* (of clerical celibacy) *were repealed: perhaps it might: but as long as it ſubſiſts, ſo long is it the duty of each individual in her community to ſubmit to it. Such are the laws of all eſtabliſhments.* Mr. Berington always thinks and *writes as he feels,* and this, he tells us, *is not his fault, becauſe the regulating of his nerves is not at his own option. (Pref. to State and Behav. p.* iv. *and Reflect. p.* 100.) It may be ſo. But then

then why ſhould the laws of any church-eſtabliſhment controul him or his nerves, when he has written ſo many *nervous* paſſages, to prove church-eſtabliſhments to be an abuſe, and contrary to the very ſpirit of chriſtianity? In 1780 Mr. Berington thought it, I mean, felt it *a very fortunate circumſtance in the diſcipline of the catholic church, that prieſts are forbidden to marry.* (*State and Behav. p.* 166.) becauſe Engliſh prieſts in general are poor. The ſame cauſe might with equal reaſon exclude the lower ranks of laymen from the benefit of the ſeventh ſacrament. At that period, Mr. Berington's nerves vibrated to feelings of compaſſion for poor prieſts; here they are tremblingly doubtful of the expediency of the celibatary laws, but what a flutter will they be in, when Heloiſa ſhall riſe to view! A pity, that the framers of the old canons were not inſtructed in the modern ſyſtem of nerves! When will Mr. Berington's nerves enable him to decide the doubtful point, whether the law of clerical celibacy ought or ought not to be repealed? Why does he keep his diſciples in anxious expectation?

P. 12.—Mr. Berington profeſſes to believe Mr. Wharton (the Worceſter apoſtate) *ſincere in the motives which ſettled his deciſion to leave the catholic church*, though he ſees reaſons to refuſe him the credit which he claims on this very ſcore. *(ibid.)* Thoſe who are acquainted with Mr. Wharton's conduct in Europe and America, may eaſily account for his converſion on the modern ſyſtem of nerves; and Mr. Berington forbids us, (p. 7.) *in every proceſs of reaſoning, to introduce more than one cauſe, if this one will account for the effect in queſtion.* Mr. Wharton wrote as he thought, and he thought as he felt.

P. 15.—*People read, not ſo much for inſtruction, as for amuſement; if then you mean to inſtruct, take care, &c.* This is advice addreſſed to the R. Mr. Pilling. Long before Mr. Berington undertook to inſtruct that learned gentleman, by whom he had been ſometimes foiled in argument, in the art of writing controverſy, it was well known, that people read more for amuſement, than for inſtruction; but it was not univerſally known, that Mr. Berington could confirm that deep truth, by two verſes from an Italian poet: *Luſinghier Parnaſſo* are pretty ſounds, and one muſt know Italian to cite them.

P. 17.

P. 17.—*Mr. Carroll, a learned, a judicious, a candid and a reſpectable clergyman, &c.* When great geniuſes deliver their own ſchemes and views of improvement, it is not unuſual for them to propoſe them under a borrowed name, or to aſcribe them to ſome known character which may add weight and dignity to them. Thus we have a multitude of harangues in Livy, Hume, &c. by heroes who never ſpoke, and here Mr. Berington's ideas of church-reformation are preſented to us under the name of Biſhop Carroll. Thoſe who converſed with this prelate in England in 1790, diſcovered in him the qualities which are here aſcribed to him, and they therefore know that America is not more widely diſtant from England, than his ideas of eccleſiaſtical government and clerical ſubordination are from Mr. Berington's *wild muſings* on this ſubject. Biſhop Carroll is exerting his endeavours to place the American catholic church on the footing of other modern catholic churches, and in the mean time he exerts with prudence and vigour the epiſcopal power of ſuſpending and interdicting a few of his clerical ſubjects, who have carried with them from Europe a tincture of modern innovation. Theſe men

are not yet sufficiently enlightened to deny his power to suspend and interdict priests.

P. 22.—*I declare there is not a single article of my creed which I have not examined with that free discussion which philosophy has taught me to adopt. . . . You must allow me at least to be a rational catholic. I am not the only one. It is folly to imagine that we have not, amongst us, men of as strong sense, as are any where to be found; and can it be supposed, that the religion of such men is that mass of absurdities*, &c. The evidence of religion does not depend upon the mental abilities of its professors. What rules of *free discussion* has philosophy taught to Mr. Berington, which his *narrow-minded, ill-educated* brethren do not possess? They certainly were not philosophers in 1780. They were then deficient in *native talents*; and *the want of education* and still more *their total inattention to improvement was an insurmountable bar to the acquisition of accomplishments*. (State and Behav. p. 129.) At the end of 1785 (see the progress of philosophy!) *they have among them men of as strong sense, as are any where to be found*. Glorious philosophy! It surmounts obstacles *insurmountable*, and of confirmed blockheads has turned at least some of our body,

body, beſides Mr. Berington, into *rational* catholics.

P. 25.—*Heaven knows, ... how thin that wall of ſeparation is, which divides us from the church of England! yet neither of us, I fear, are acquainted with that temper of mind, upon which, as the moſt eſſential requiſite, the whole buſineſs hinges.* Heaven knows the contrary, or heaven has ſtrangely deceived us. If temper be the main hinge, ſurely the few *rational catholics of ſtrong ſenſe* muſt at leaſt be *acquainted with this eſſential requiſite.* Strange, that the *rubbiſh* of old narrow-minded controvertiſts ſhould ſtill block up the paſſage of the thin wall, which yet debars them from *ranging in freer fields.* Till philoſophy ſhall have melted down more of our bigotry, we men of unimproved intellectuals muſt think, that the catholic church will never be in a *temper* to ſurrender a ſingle article of her belief. And as the whole buſineſs, with us, *hinges*, not on temper, but on the immutability of our faith, we ſhall expect no coalition, till our diſſenting brethren ſhall be in a temper to admit our whole creed, without the ſmalleſt conceſſion on our ſide. Mr. Berington thinks the method of mutual *conceſſions* very obvious and

eaſy

eaſy. He has already conceded more, than his own biſhop or the catholic church will ratify.

P. 26.—*I am an enemy to church-eſtabliſhments.* So is every modern philanthropiſt, who has not learned, or has forgotten the catholic catechiſm. Thoſe who know it, remember that the firſt church-eſtabliſhment was made by Chriſt and his apoſtles, and that it conſiſts of the body of faith, which the paſtors of the church muſt preach, and the laws of diſcipline, which they may enact, and have a divine right to enforce. The authority of the paſtors is eſſential to this eſtabliſhment, and as it is derived from Chriſt, all mankind are commanded to ſubmit to it, nor can it be reſiſted, thwarted or deſtroyed without a crime. All civil power is bound to protect it, and to allow free energy to the authority which is eſſential to it. Where this authority has free room to act, there a church-eſtabliſhment exiſts. Wealth, rank and precedence before the lords of the land are not eſſential to it. Mr. Berington muſt either relinquiſh his own principle of univerſal toleration, or allow us a church-eſtabliſhment of this deſcription, though he has taxed King James with folly, for attempting to procure it.

it. But he will ſtill retain his enmity to eſtabliſhments, diſtinguiſhed by marks of particular or excluſive favour. Why ſo? Is it poſſible that a man can be ſeriouſly convinced of the divine origin and uttermoſt importance of his religion; is it poſſible that he ſhould be ſoundly perſuaded of the truth of even a philoſophical opinion, and not wiſh to ſee it revered, adopted, countenanced and *eſtabliſhed?* Shall a philoſopher be applauded for his zeal to propagate an uſeful art, and Mr. Coleman be upbraided *as a bigot, for wiſhing to give a ſpread to his religion?* Shall the faireſt daughter of heaven be denied the rights of denizen? Shall ſhe be left a vagabond on the earth, whom God ordained to be *eſtabliſhed in the city on the ſummit of the hill*, and from thence to enlighten the globe? Mr. Berington pronounces *a church-eſtabliſhment unfavourable to the growth of truth*, and St. Paul ſhews us the pillar of truth rooted in its very centre. Which of theſe two doctors ſhall we follow? Not all the ſheets of paper, on which Mr. Berington has ſpread out his *wild muſings* on religion, will be ever able to cover this pillar.

P. 28.—*I go not out of my own country. Yet all theſe* (Church of England men, Preſbyterians, Quakers, Anabaptiſts and other religioniſts)

gionists) *profess to believe in revelation and have searched the scriptures. If out of condescension to their respective opinions, I reject as unscriptural what they reject; how much will be left for me to receive in the line of revealed truths? Little more than this, that there is a God: but this needed no revelation; for reason alone had taught it to Plato and to the ancient world.* The English religionists then, according to Mr. Berington, have rejected every article of christian revelation, excepting the existence of God. This Mr. Berington thinks unnecessary. God, who revealed it, thought otherwise. Catholics maintain, that they have preserved all articles of christian revelation; they do not think one of them unnecessary, and they hold, that an obstinate refusal to believe any one of them duly proposed, is an effectual separation from the catholic church. Hence they are at a loss to understand, how they are divided only by *a thin partition* from all or any one of those sects, who have, at least jointly, rejected every article that God has revealed, except the *unnecessary* one of his existence. They also expect to be informed, how *reason alone* teaching the existence of God to Mr. Berington or Plato, can suffice for either of those gentlemen to *receive it in the line of revealed*

*vealed truths.* Our old controvertiſts, amidſt other *rubbiſh*, teach us, that nothing can be received in the line of revealed truths, or believed with divine faith, unleſs it be revealed by God. In the light of revelation we chriſtians know God; but few indeed were thoſe, to whom reaſon dimmed with vice and philoſophy, diſcovered this primary truth in the ancient world. Still fewer were thoſe, who worſhipped the God whom they knew. How many can Mr. Berington count of either ſort?

P. 29.—An uncommiſſioned teacher of chriſtian religion, who denies the divinity of our Redeemer and his atonement for the crimes of the world, is here dignified with the title of *wiſe.* I hope Mr. Berington means the wiſdom, which is of this world, and does not envy us the poſſeſſion of the precious folly of chriſtian faith, which we conceive to be wiſdom before God.

P. 31.—*What liberty of diſcuſſion, or, if you will, of* DOUBTING, *does any chriſtian poſſeſs, that we have not?* I know not how the apoſtate, to whom the queſtion is addreſſed, would anſwer it. I, as a catholic, can inform Mr. Berington, upon the credit of our old controvertiſts, that if he be of my religion, he has

no liberty or right whatever to doubt of a ſingle article of it, and that, according to my catechiſm, doubt is inconſiſtent with that ſtrength and firmneſs, which is eſſential to catholic faith.—*In fide, nihil dubitans.*

P. 32.—*So much has been ſaid on the manner of Chriſt's preſence in the euchariſt, that it is not poſſible we can ever agree; hardly indeed is it poſſible we can underſtand one another.* The euchariſt is an eſſential point of catholic faith, and, I preſume, Mr. Berington will allow, that in the *conceſſions* which he adviſes us to make to Proteſtants, we cannot conveniently give it up. As the matter now ſtands, we have Mr. Berington's word for it, an agreement between us *is impoſſible.* What then are we to think of *the thin partition-wall*, and *heaven knows how thin it is?* Nay *it is hardly poſſible that we ſhould underſtand one another.* I have ſometimes found it hard to underſtand the language of my *diſſenting* brethren on this point, becauſe different perſons, even of the ſame ſect, have often given me different accounts. Our authentic language on this matter is ſpoken by the council of Trent. If Proteſtants wiſh to know it, I invite them to read the eleven canons of chap. 8. ſeſſ. 13; and though Mr. Berington aſſerts (p. 32.) that

that they cannot *underſtand* them, yet Mr Berington will aſſure them (p. 62.) that in theſe and in all other decrees of this council, *there is a ſcience, a preciſion, a clearneſs, a claſſical elegance, in every period and expreſſion that will charm them.* I believe there does not exiſt a catholic writer, who has ſaid more on the ſubject of the euchariſt, than what is delivered in theſe celebrated canons; and yet Mr. Berington informs us, that the reaſon why we can neither underſtand one another nor agree about it, is, becauſe *ſo much has been already ſaid.* If the council then has ſaid too much, why does he ſay any thing more? at leaſt, why does he not ſay ſomething more to the purpoſe?

P. 35.—*I had not the moſt diſtant ſuſpicion, that I could claim any privilege* (in religion) *which did not equally reach to the peaſant that followed his plough.* Why then does Mr. Berington claim the privilege of *doubting* of matters of faith? Why does he aſſert *ſpiritual juriſdiction independent of, and uncontroulable by the head of the church?* Why does he adviſe us to make *conceſſions* in religion? No peaſant, who has learned his catechiſm, would claim theſe privileges. He has convinced himſelf with Mr. Berington (p. 36.) that God has

has given us an *unerring* church, and from that inſtant he knows, that not to acquieſce ſubmiſſively in her doctrines, is folly. Mr. Berington too knows this; but becauſe he is a philoſopher and not a ploughman, he muſt *feel many things weigh heavy on his mind*, he muſt *wiſh for freer fields to range in*, he muſt *throw aſide his books with indignation, when they convince him, that he is obliged to believe what an unerring church propoſes to him.* (P. 57.) The happy clown feels none of theſe philoſophical tranſports; he is ſatisfied with the liberty of the children of God, which Chriſt has acquired for him, and he pants not *to range in freer fields*, which, an *unerring* church tells him, are without her pale. What are Mr. Berington's *muſings* on the inerrancy of this church?

P. 68.—*What very extraordinary co-operation is required, that men, habituated to the concerns of religion, ſhould be able to declare, what doctrine they were taught, and what they then believe? . . . And this is the wondrous infallibility, about which reams of paper have been written, that would more than cover the whole ſurface of the globe!* It is not plain, whether Mr. Berington here uſes the prophetic ſtyle of the apoſtle, who *thinks that the world would*

not

*not contain the books that might be written*, John xxi. 25. or whether he ſpeaks with mathematical preciſion, from a comparative meaſurement of the ſurface of the globe, and of the volumes of old controvertiſts on infallibility, which he has actually read. Which ever be the caſe, it ſeems, theſe old gentlemen were woefully bewildered for want of a philoſopher to explain the matter to them in a dozen lines. *All inſtruction*, ſays Mr. Berington, (p. 45) *is progreſſive; all was not to be given at once.* For ages had the church blundered on without any clear idea of her prerogative of infallibility; her fathers and doctors had been for centuries preparing materials to paper the earth,—but the enucleation of the difficulty was reſerved to illuſtrate the cloſe of the eighteenth age, when we are at length informed, that inerrancy in truths divine requires *no extraordinary co-operation* of the divine Spirit, for that men habituated to a trade can ſurely tell by the common powers of unaided nature, what they were taught, and what they actually know about their profeſſional buſineſs. If clamorous divines ſhould contend for *extraordinary co-operation*, from the conſideration, that primitive traditions of religion and the very belief of the unity of

God

God (which needs no revelation) degenerated into polytheiſm in the ancient world, even under the eyes of the patriarchs, who were *habituated to the concerns of religion*,—the anſwer is ready prepared. Mr. Berington *is no friend to controverſy* and diſpute; he expects *truth in its native ſimplicity, unattended by clamour and ſtrife; he will receive it only from the mouth that inſtructs, and by inſtruction perſuades*, (p. 5.) and of courſe this is the method in which he means to convey it. He is no friend to the ſcholaſtic method of diſcovering truth by ſyllogiſtic induction; he leaves this to the upholſterers of the globe, truth darts from him with *progreſſive* irradiance, and if his diſciples are not *perſuaded by the inſtruction* which he has vouchſafed them on the doctrine of infallibility, he will undoubtedly conclude, that *God has not given them that ſomething called reaſon, which* PERHAPS *he has given to the elephant and the ox.* (P. 33.) As all inſtruction is progreſſive, perhaps the next illuminated doctor may inform us, that ſince this *wondrous infallibility* depends ſingly on memory, the ſolemn promiſe of it, recorded in the goſpel, was juſt as needleſs, as was the revelation of God's exiſtence, which being eaſily diſcoverable *by*

*reaſon*

*reaſon alone*, may *perhaps* one day be found out by the ox and the elephant. What an improvement will this be in the philoſophical world! We ſhall not then want Lord Monboddo to teach Peter the Ouran Outang to talk Erſe; *perhaps* even inferior apes may dictate leſſons in divinity.

P. 69.—*The repreſentative body* (of the catholic church) *are our prelates: the repreſented are the people: and at the head of this inſtitution is the Pope, in whoſe hands reſides the principal executive power. . . . . He has indeed his prerogative, but we have our privileges, and are independent on him, excepting where it has pleaſed the community to ſurrender into his hands a limited ſuperintendance.* If this were a true account of the government of the church, we might imagine that the apoſtles, in ſettling it, had copied Blackſtone's Commentaries on the Laws of England. As it is, it is a part of the *wild muſings* of Edmond Richer, improved with a few conſtitutional terms by Mr. Berington. If Chriſt and the apoſtles had left the form of church-government and the powers of its chief governor undetermined, we might then perhaps talk of *prerogative* ſurrendered to him by the community, of privileges which they have reſerved to themſelves,

and of *proper and eſſential juriſdiction* belonging to particular prieſts and paſtors, independent on the ſovereign pontiff. In the real catholic ſyſtem, the ſovereign pontiff has indeed his prerogative, but he holds it from Jeſus Chriſt. Every thing in the church is ſubordinate to it, no privilege exiſts independent on him, no juriſdiction (Mr. Berington's excepted) is known, which does not emanate from his. His duty of ſuperintendance is impoſed on him by Chriſt, not ſurrendered to him by the community; the ſheep and the ſhepherds alike are ſubject to him; the former are not repreſented as conſtituents, nor are the latter elected repreſentatives; there is here no relation of deputies and conſtituents; the whole flock is governed by the ſureme ſhepherd, and the ſeveral portions of it are again governed, with ſubordination to the ſupreme ruler, by inferior ſhepherds deputed by him, and from him is derived the quantity and extent of their juriſdiction. All this originates from heaven, not a mite of it is derived from the votes or deputation of the community, who not having received any commiſſion to rule the church, cannot beſtow any juriſdiction on their paſtors. *Nemo dat quod non habet.*

P. 70.

P. 70.—*With princes he* (the Pope) *has no concern.* Indeed? Princes then are neither *ſheep* nor *lambs.* Would Mr. Berington have them to be *goats?* He could not mention the Pope, without diſcharging a back-ſhaft at *the extravagant abuſe of power* of old pontiffs; but *the time is come,* he ſays, *when the influence of Rome is returning to its proper channel; and when it ſhall be ſeen that his juriſdiction is benevolent and paternal.....that he is prudent, moderate, patient, meek and humble; then will the Biſhop of Rome be reſpected, and on this reſpect will be founded an authority, &c. &c.* Catholics think, that the grounds on which the Pope's power reſts, entitle it to reſpect, whatever be the private character of the man who holds it. They think moreover that the juriſdiction of the Pope has in every age appeared benevolent and paternal, and that, with a few exceptions, prudence, moderation, patience, meekneſs and humility have been virtues always attendant on St. Peter's chair. They are ſeated upon it at preſent in their brighteſt forms. Even Mr. Berington ſeems to own in this page, that there is a beginning of ſomething good about the court of Rome, but it is not yet time to ſhew *reſpect* to it. This ſhall be given only *when it ſhall be ſeen* that

Popes poſſeſs virtues, and then at length they ſhall enjoy *an authority founded on that reſpect.* Thanks for the prophecy. But may it not be preſumed, that philoſophers will long remain dim-ſighted to papal virtues; and, as they will therefore withhold *reſpect*, they will of courſe continue to deny papal authority? Hence they will perſevere in depreciating the reigning pontiff, by exaggerating the treſpaſſes of his remote predeceſſors, they will cavil on every exertion of ſpiritual juriſdiction uſed by him or his vicars, they will, above all, ſteadily aſſert and arrogate *a proper and eſſential juriſdiction wholly uncontroulable by, and independent of, the See of Rome.* Catholics, who believe the Pope's ſpiritual authority to be founded on ſomething different from the *future reſpect* of philoſophers, hope to be *tolerated*, if they ſhew ſome regard for it at preſent.

P. 71, 72, &c.—Mr. Berington acknowledges the exiſtence of many religious practices, which he cenſures as *abuſes and follies*, in ſome catholic countries, and he thinks, that *if Mr. Hawkins had ſeen as much of France as he has of Flanders, his invective would have been leſs intemperate.* If theſe two gentlemen would now make a progreſs through France, they

they would probably both have cauſe to be ſatisfied with the improvements made by the philoſophical rulers of that reformed church. Theſe abuſes are the *niching of mawmets in churches, the hanging of eyes, legs and arms round altars, the chriſtening of bells, and the ſprinkling of horſes.* (P. 74.) He calls them *indignities*, he agrees with Mr. Hawkins *to laugh at them*, and he *laments, that a creature which is called rational, can deviate ſo ſtrangely into folly, when he means to ſerve his Maker.* (P. 75.) Mr. Berington's joining in a laugh at religious practices with Mr. Hawkins, is no proof that they are *fooliſh* or *abuſive.* They have both laughed at Monachiſm which Catholics ſtill reſpect. What are theſe *niched mawmets* which diſgrace creatures *called* rational, and thereby make Meſſieurs Berington and Hawkins merry? They are ſtatues, (which architects generally place in niches,) and though they are not always executed with elegance and taſte, yet with perſons, who cannot procure others of more refined execution, they anſwer the purpoſe, for which the church allows ſtatues to be *niched* in our places of public worſhip. Why muſt Catholics be ſtript of *rationality*, (which *perhaps* belongs to oxen and elephants,) for hanging up arms and legs

in

in churches, when they believe that the uſe of thoſe limbs has been reſtored to them by Almighty God? Is it rational to preſent tokens of gratitude to a ſurgeon, and irrational to offer them to the Giver of all good gifts? In the practices of the catholic church, God is ever held in view; all his gifts are ſanctified by prayer; whatever is deputed to the ſervice of public worſhip is ſpecially hallowed by theſe benedictions; bread, water, wax, garments, fire, incenſe, and even bells are objects of theſe religious ceremonies; they are bleſſed by prayer, by croſſes, and they are ſprinkled with holy water; but where has Mr. Berington ſeen theſe things applied to horſes? Why not to horſes? If things inanimate may be bleſſed and *ſprinkled*, why not horſes, who *perhaps*, as well as oxen, have *that ſomething which men call reaſon*, and which Mr. Berington ſo ſtrangely miſuſes? Comparing this paſſage with p. 20. I preſume theſe practices may be reckoned among the *cumbrous weight of ceremonies and unmeaning pageantry, which material conceptions have introduced into European practice, and which a proper ſenſe of the dignity of religion will point out to Biſhop Carroll as proper objects of reformation.* There is a timidity, a diffidence in Mr. Berington's

language on this ſubject; his nerves ſeem to admoniſh him, that it is not yet time to ſpeak out boldly what he wiſhes; his irreſolution diſguſts me, but for my comfort there *is a ſcience, a preciſion, a clearneſs, a claſſical elegance* in the following canon of the council of Trent, *which charms me. Si quis dixerit receptos et approbatos eccleſiæ catholicæ ritus, in ſolemni ſacramentorum adminiſtratione adhiberi conſuetos, aut contemni, aut ſine peccato a miniſtris pro libito omitti, aut in novos alios per quemcumque eccleſiarum paſtorem mutari poſſe; anathema ſit.* Seſſ. 7. De Sacram. in gen. can. 13.

P. 78.—*The refuſal of chriſtian burial to Proteſtants, is, I confeſs, a cruel circumſtance; it is come down from thoſe barbarous ages, when the milder virtues of chriſtianity were hardly felt.* Which were theſe ages? Has any age of Chriſt's church been unprovided of theſe virtues? Was ſhe influenced by barbariſm when ſhe forbade the proſtitution of her ſacred rites of burial to perſons, who are aliens to her, who are not her children? Was the church to wait to the latter ages, to learn reſpect for the dead from the ſons of Calvin, whoſe implacable zeal for reformation ſpared neither her temples nor her tombs? In ſpite

of

of Mr. Berington, I ſuſpect that the church muſt have ſome reaſon for her conduct. Being eſſentially intolerant of error, (however Mr. Berington may be offended at her for it,) ſhe cannot communicate in religion with aliens during their lives; why then ſhould ſhe commence communion with them after their death? Theſe perſons do not believe her dogmas of faith; ſome of them do not believe a future reſurrection: many diſbelieve a middle ſtate of expiation, and many again mock at prayer for the dead, as much as Mr. Berington laughs at friariſm and *ſprinkling*. The church holds her ſolemn ſervices to be ſacred and venerable. That of funerals is principally relative to the future reſurrection of the fleſh and the intermediate ſtate of temporal puniſhment. When the late venerable Archbiſhop of Paris was taxed with fanaticiſm in refuſing burial to Voltaire, he wiſely anſwered, that it would be a mockery of theſe two catholic tenets, to recite a ſolemn ſervice grounded upon them, over the corpſe of a man, who had ſpent his life in ridiculing and inſulting them. The catholic church is conſiſtent in her tenets and her practices. If Mr. Berington were equally ſo, he might ſurely reckon our funeral ceremonies among

among the *cumbrous load of unmeaning pageantry which wants reformation*, eſpecially as *ſprinkling* is one of them, and they are all very ancient, that is, were invented *in thoſe barbarous ages, when the mild virtues of chriſtianity were hardly felt.* Why then does he covet them for Proteſtants? If Mr. Berington ſhould think proper to burſt through *the thin partition*, the catholic church will not hinder him from burying his *mild virtues* in any *free field* that he may chuſe: ſhe will only refuſe to do it for him.

P. 81—*You ceaſe to be a Roman Catholic, that is, you drop a few ſpeculative opinions.* Is this the explanation of a theologian? The real preſence, the ſupremacy of the Pope, the inerrancy of the church, purgatory, &c. are ſome of the tenets, which diſtinguiſh Catholics from Engliſh Proteſtants, and which Mr. Hawkins *dropped* upon his apoſtacy from the church of Rome. If theſe are *opinions*, then they may be falſe, and Mr. Berington has no right to blame him. Articles of faith are not opinions, they are certainties.

P. 82.—*The emperor, it is ſaid, has no religion: it may be ſo: but if that indulgence of diſpoſition, which I commend, be thought to prove it, it would be well for mankind if other princes had*

*as little.* My firſt remark, on reading this tract ſeven years ago, was, that it might eaſily unſettle the faith of weak Catholics, but that it would never convert a Proteſtant. Mr. Berington allows that the firſt would be an *unfriendly* action. (P. 76.) He has throughout his book diſplayed a marked contempt of the miniſters, the authority and the practices of the catholic church, and he here plainly diſcovers his perſuaſion, that the want of all religion in princes would be a benefit to their ſubjects, provided they were indulgent and philanthropic as the late Joſeph. This weak prince's *indulgence* was reſerved for thoſe, who concurred in his project of debaſing catholic religion, and of robbing its miniſters and profeſſors of their authority and juſteſt rights. Joſeph II. and the Gallic aſſembly equally prove the definition of modern toleration, which has been ſtated above.—Mr. Berington is in the right to claim toleration. No man wants it ſo much. His perſon, his property and his philoſophical *muſings* will certainly always find it; yea and his theological miſtakes have been twelve years diſſembled, they might even yet paſs unheeded amidſt the crude maſs of errors of the times, but it muſt not be allowed, that he ſhould

continue to publiſh them as catholic truths. This is the only degree of *toleration*, which I refuſe him.

P. 95.—*How unchriſtian is all intolerance!* What a fuſs this Mr. Berington makes about toleration and intolerance; two words, which he has never explained. He every where advances the moſt unlimited claim to the former; and he moſt intolerantly imputes the latter to whoever has the hardineſs to queſtion the rectitude of his doctrines. Poſſibly ſome of my readers may have formed but indiſtinct ideas of theſe two things, and if I with-hold my opinion of them, they may perhaps believe Mr. Berington, when he will call me the moſt intolerant of bigots.

The warmeſt advocates for *general toleration* admit, that it ought not to be allowed to perſons or opinions, which endanger the well-being of ſociety, the peace and tranquillity of ſubjects, or the juſt rights of their governors. The experience of ages has proved, that alterations in religion are generally the forerunners and pretexts of civil commotions; and on this evidence, moſt ſovereigns who have found a ſingle religion eſtabliſhed in their ſtates, have conſidered it as a primary duty to check the early riſing and progreſs

of new ſects; and from the Donatiſts to the preſent day, when ſeverity has been uſed to ſuppreſs them, faction, not opinion, has commonly been the object of puniſhment. Political and civil toleration is more or leſs allowed to diſcordant ſects, as governments think it convenient; and they who enjoy it, would well deſerve to loſe the indulgence, if they abuſed it to diſturb the public order, by inſulting the predominant religion, which is particularly ſupported and favoured by the public authority of the ſtate. With kings and rulers of ſtates, the intereſt of the community has generally been the meaſure of toleration and intolerance. If the miniſters of public juſtice knew, that Mr. Berington, tolerated as a catholic, had publicly declared himſelf *an enemy to all church-eſtabliſhments*, that *he is not aſhamed to ſay, that the government which is beſt inclined to give us protection*, HAS THE ONLY RIGHT *to demand our allegiance*; that *a king of England deſerved to loſe his head*, for having made political connexions with a foreign power; could they poſſibly *tolerate* the ſpreading of ſuch doctrines without interruption? When various ſects are quietly ſettled, and they demean themſelves peaceably towards the government of the ſtate, in my conception

it

it would be an injuſtice to debar them from practices of religion which are inoffenſive to the general tranquillity; ſuch toleration is, I believe, never refuſed, nor is there, probably, a ſingle biſhop in the church, who wiſhes it to be denied. Civil toleration in this ſenſe is the wiſh of every rational man, and it is granted by every rational government; but there is another ſort of toleration, which, for diſtinction, I call *eccleſiaſtical* or *theological*. It is the indiſcriminate admiſſion of all kinds of doctrine, and it is, in its own nature, perfectly inconſiſtent with the catholic ſcheme of faith.

Catholics make open profeſſion of believing a faith, a doctrine, a religion revealed by God. What God has revealed, they ſay, is removed beyond their power, and when revelation is once aſcertained, they think it a criminal abſurdity, to ſet up a claim to liberty of opinion and freedom of choice. They hold that God has eſtabliſhed one church, that he has appointed the paſtors of this church to preſerve the body of revealed truths unaltered and entire, and by all conſequence, that the deciſions of theſe paſtors are final. They cannot conceive either that God requires no worſhip, or that he accepts all wor-

ſhip

ſhip with indifference. As Chriſt came to inſtruct mankind, he could not allow them a free choice between truth and error. He foretold indeed, that this doctrine, which preaches peace, would divide mankind; but ſtill he exacted a preference for his doctrine; no other was true, and he proved it. As we believe that God has both fixed this doctrine by revelation, and has appointed judges to aſcertain it, we think it a crime to refuſe ſubmiſſion to their word. Whoever refuſes it, muſt acknowledge that he has relinquiſhed the catholic principle; he will be conſidered, and if he be a teacher, he will be denounced as ſuſpected in faith, he will enjoy his civil right, he may even retain his errors unmoleſted, but the catholic church muſt reject him as one who is not of her fold. In other religions where the ſame authority is not acknowledged in the paſtors, a greater latitude in the toleration of religious doctrines will probably be practiſed, becauſe there no man aſſumes to himſelf a right to dogmatize, which, on his own principle, he does not equally recognize in others. But the catholic church acknowledging in her biſhops an excluſive right to judge of doctrine without appeal, and diſclaiming every idea of alteration in her

faith,

faith, watches with a jealous eye the early beginnings of innovation; her biſhops warn their flocks where there is but a danger of ſeduction, and their zeal is always moſt active, when the innovation ariſes from within their own pale, from the centre of their own ſanctuary, and novel opinions are preſented under the ſemblance of catholic truths. Rectitude of faith is eſſential to our religion, and our biſhops can no more tolerate error in belief, than they can authorize immorality in action. Hence the catholic church is eſſentially *intolerant* of ſpeculative or practical error in religion, ſhe is ſilent when it is taught by perſons who are aliens to her; but never will her biſhops ſuppreſs the paſtoral warning, when the faith of their flocks is expoſed to the riſk of alteration. Their zeal will be the more active when the doctrinal errors of innovators are blended with principles hoſtile to the government of their country; the credit of religion will then prompt them to take the lead of the guardians of the laws, whoſe miniſtry is equally intereſted to repreſs doctrines which may endanger the public tranquillity.

I have already made a long comment upon a ſhort text; but as the matter is important,

portant, Mr. Berington muſt ſuffer me to muſe on a while. I know that the divine author of our religion might have re-united our minds in one faith, as he might alſo have compelled our wills to the obſervance of all his precepts. He has not done either of theſe things, becauſe ſuch a miracle was not conformable to the ſyſtem of his providence, to the free nature of man, or to the character of chriſtian faith, which muſt be meritorious and therefore free. But it does not follow from this, that we are allowed to prefer falſehood to truth, vice to virtue, or that obſtinacy in error, as well as moral turpitude, will not be puniſhed by the common Father. He has given all judgment to his Son, and this Son has pronounced, that he who ſhall not have believed his doctrines, ſhall be condemned. The inflicting of juſt vengeance on wilful incredulity in the next world is reſerved to the prerogative of the Son of God; and though the ſucceſſors of his apoſtles wiſh to preſerve all men from incurring it, yet guided by his example in the exerciſe of their miniſtry, they know that mental errors are not to be puniſhed by civil reſtraints, becauſe their divine maſter did not preach his goſpel with ſword

and

and fire, or command them to bring back the erroneous by the terror of chaſtiſement. They meditate his dreadful word, "that unbelievers "will be condemned," but they alſo imitate the charity with which he excuſed the unbelieving Jews and tenderly prayed for them on the croſs.

All this is perfectly conſiſtent with the moſt inflexible zeal to preſerve the purity of faith in its primitive integrity, and if Mr. Berington expects that the orthodox ſhould be indifferent about doctrine, and equalize their own tenets with thoſe of rival ſects, he requires an impoſſibility. If he means that the orthodox ought not to moleſt their diſſenting neighbours by turbulent and ſeditious conduct, it is a leſſon which he may learn from his catholic brethren, not one of whom has, like himſelf, denounced *hoſtility againſt all eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, which the ſecular arm ſupports*, or has boaſted *that he views with pleaſure the attacks*, which are levelled againſt that of his country. He alone has counted *the grains of gunpowder, begun to be laid, which in proper ſeaſon will explode and produce the deſired effect*; he alone has appreciated *the ſkill and perſeverance of the chief engineer*; (*See an addreſs to the Proteſtant Diſſenters by the Rev. Joſ.*

*Berington, pages* 40. 41.) Other catholics are not in the ſecret of the miners, and they ſincerely hope, that no man of the catholic name will ever enliſt himſelf, as the Guy Vaux of the party. More tolerant than Mr. Berington, they quietly ſubmit to the economy of public order, they would think it criminal to diſturb it, and they do not repine to ſee a church-eſtabliſhment favoured by the government which protects them, though their conſcience forbids them to adhere to it, and they are excluded from a participation in its emoluments. Intolerant they certainly are, but only of theological error in their own communion; becauſe this is eſſential to their religion, and indifference is not compatible with an interiour conviction that their tenets are ſtamped with the mark of certainty. It is natural for man to attach importance even to his opinions, and in this view, intolerance is not more peculiar to religion, than to any other opinion or ſyſtem that intereſts mankind. Mr. Berington thinks it impoſſible that men ſhould ever agree in religion; *(Life of Abeillard, p.* 157. *& alibi,)* how can he expect that they ſhould agree in indifference about religion? Convinced that I am in poſſeſſion of true religion, I muſt naturally wiſh to extend it,

it, and to induce others, by perſuaſion and inſtruction to embrace it. If Mr. Berington may preach unlimited toleration of all religious doctrines, becauſe he approves it, ſhall he refuſe me the liberty of recommending a doctrine which I like better? If my theological intolerance be a crime, can his be a virtue? In fact there are not men more illiberally intolerant, than philoſophers who preach unlimited toleration. Their toleration is, at firſt, indifference to every religion, and it ſoon ripens into hatred againſt all. *Toleration* in their language, is like *liberty* in the mouth of the ſeditious. Unjuſt like the ancient Romans, they demand freedom for themſelves and ſlavery for all others. The preſent ſtate of religion in France exemplifies theſe truths.

To conclude, what is the difference between Mr. Berington and other catholics on this point? When it is taken in the *eccleſiaſtical* and *theological* ſenſe, he demands univerſal and unlimited toleration of every kind of doctrine; they can tolerate none that wants the ſanction of their biſhops. He calls *all* intolerance *unchriſtian*; they think intolerance of novelty eſſential to chriſtianity. He ſeems

to ground his happineſs on toleration of all error; they found theirs on purity of faith. In regard of *civil* toleration, he and they equally applaud it, and think it due to the peaceful profeſſors of every known religion in the land; but he is a profeſſed enemy to the *eſtabliſhment* of any religion, true or falſe; they wiſh their own eſtabliſhed throughout the world, becauſe they believe it true. He denounces open hoſtility againſt the eſtabliſhment of that, which the majority of his countrymen have preferred; they bow ſubmiſſion to the public will, in which they cannot concur, and will never harbour a thought or attempt a deed which may affect the tranquillity of the ſtate which protects them. Let any man, who is not a philoſopher, judge on which ſide reaſon lies.

REMARKS

# REMARKS

ON THE

*Hiſtory of the Lives of Abeillard and Heloiſa, with their genuine Letters, by the Rev. Joſeph Berrington.— Birmingham, 1787.*

THE length of this performance renders it a difficult taſk to purſue the author through every page of a motley ſtory, though almoſt each is tinctured with the ſame errors, which I have remarked in the preceding works. The ſame fondneſs for innovation, the ſame unqualified claim for toleration of error, the ſame ſpite againſt the depoſitaries of ſpiritual authority, the ſame contempt for what the catholic church reſpects and venerates, are the principles which guide the author's pen, and he ſeems to diſplay them with a fondneſs and zeal, which beſpeak ſome perſonal intereſt. Philanthropy and liberality of ſentiment perſecuted

ſecuted by ſuperſtition and bigotry, form the fable of the tale, and Auguſtus is not more clearly marked in the character of Eneas, than Mr. Berington perſecuted by unmelted bigots of the college, is ſhadowed in the adventures of the unfortunate Abeillard. No other intereſt could have engaged a man of talents to ſelect for an hiſtoric theme the uninviting ſtory of a vain, ſelfiſh and capricious prieſt; and as nobody beſides Mr. Berington can feel this little intereſt tickling his heart, it is no wonder that ſo few copies have been ſold, notwithſtanding the old ſhop-trick of advertiſing a ſecond edition, with a new frontiſpiece to the firſt. A few remarks upon this performance will anſwer my purpoſe of diſplaying Mr. Berington's genuine principles, and I hope I may ſpend my time better, than in ſtudying the reſt of his works.

P. 19. 20.—We are informed that *the city of Paris, the moſt enlightened in the univerſe,* pays *ſuperſtitious veneration to a ſhepherdeſs named St. Genevieve, which every traveller has witneſſed, and every good man has lamented.* Mr. Berington ought to have told us, what ſuperſtitious practices are here uſed, and this would have been as much connected with his hiſtory,

as

as the two cruſades and moſt other hiſtorical paſſages contained in it. I have been at St. Genevieve's, but I neither witneſſed nor lamented any ſuperſtitious veneration practiſed there. I aſked, why the ſhrine of the holy ſhepherdeſs attracted crowds of votaries, while the royal relics of the ſovereign, St. Lewis, were but thinly attended. A reverend prieſt anſwered, " that, even in the order of ſanctity, Almighty God ſeemed to give a marked preference to lowlineſs of ſtation." Perhaps Mr. Berington will not admit me to be *a good man*, but will he refuſe that title to the biſhops and clergy of the metropolis of France, to the monarchs and magiſtrates of that kingdom, who, for ages, have venerated the ſhrine of their humble and ſaintly patroneſs? They thought it not ſuperſtition, becauſe they were catholics; but the *good men*, who have now ſtripped them of their power, have cleared away all this *fatras*, and have transferred their veneration to the philoſophic aſhes of Voltaire and Rouſſeau. When Mr. Berington goes next to Paris, his *goodneſs* will find nothing to *lament* at St. Genevieve's.

P. 21.—*To purſue an object of ambition with unceaſing ardour* is here made a characteriſtic of ſanctity. This ſarcaſm is firſt levelled at a private

private bishop, William de Champeaux, and is afterwards illustrated in the account given of the several popes, who governed the church in the eleventh century. Mr. Berington's general picture of them is disfigured by all the distorted features invented by modern enemies of the see of Rome. When he describes these popes, he seems to forget that their age was distinguished beyond others by an inundation of vices, and that as the greatness of the evil required, so the stubborn character of many of the offenders justified severity in correction. The aim of the Innocents, Urbans, Gregories and Adrians of this age was to re-establish justice and order throughout the church; the means which they employed, though sometimes improper, had been prepared, by what was then deemed the wisdom of anteriour ages, and they did not rest merely on *a newly discovered collection of decrees*, to which, Mr. Berington tells us, *the weak criticism of the times gave great authority.* (*p.* 35.) The *newly discovered* decretals of Isidore Mercator had then existed above three hundred years, the principles of them had been admitted still longer, and though the defects, which modern criticism has detected in them, were then unperceived, yet *the weak criticism of the*

*times*

*times* could diſcover that the decretals were produced long after the age of St. Leo, or St. Gregory, or other ancient pontiffs, in whoſe deeds and letters were found precedents for moſt of the acts of power which theſe decretals authoriſed. Why then does Mr. Berington ſo juſtly acknowledge that the object of the popes in the eleventh century was *to extend the benign influence of religion, (p.* 35.) and ſo unjuſtly repreſent them as graſping *at univerſal monarchy like Cæſar and Alexander?* Why does he ever give us caricatures inſtead of portraits? The antagoniſts of ancient Popes are every where pictured as pitiable objects, perſecuted by *ſaintly popes, purſuing the object of their ambition with unceaſing ardour*; little or nothing is ſaid of the vices and violences of the men, who happily for the age, in which they ſinned, ſtill dreaded ſpiritual puniſhments, when no others could reach them. In the preſent age, when the moſt diſintereſted exertions of ſpiritual authority are reſiſted with mockery and inſult, it is faſhionable to miſrepreſent the views of ancient biſhops, becauſe this tends to weaken the reſpect and ſubmiſſion, which the virtues of their ſuffering ſucceſſors demand from whoever is a chriſtian and has a heart. Mr. Berington

owns, I know not how, (p. 99.) that the popes of the eleventh century *were the firſt men of their age in abilities and moral virtues*, and yet his book is as much a declamation againſt their extravagancies, pride, ambition and tyranny, as it is an hiſtory of the life of Abeillard. Mr. Berington is a philoſopher.

P. 39.—*It* (veneration for the inſtruments of our Saviour's paſſion) *may be called new.* Mr. Berington is a *learned ſcribe, and like the houſeholder he bringeth forth out of his treaſure, new things and old*, according as they can ſerve his purpoſe, which I ſuſpect to be rather *new.* When modern popes and biſhops are to be diſcredited, he ſhames them down with the *old* ſins of the Urbans and Gregories, which were forgiven near a thouſand long years ago. When *old* practices of piety are to be vilified, he oppoſes to them the *new muſings* of French philoſophers, nay he advances farther, and upon his own credit, he pronounces them *new.* In the page now before me, he applies this epithet in italics to chriſtian reſpect and veneration for the inſtruments of our Saviour's paſſion, becauſe he can trace it no higher than the era of Conſtantin and Helen. He charitably owns, that this *new* devotion *was founded on ideas of piety in paſt centuries*; but to

preſerve

preſerve his brethren in the eighteenth from ſuch dangerous *novelties*, he takes care to inform them, on the credit of an author, *who does not always reaſon juſtly*, (ibid) (I believe, Voltaire) that *no man left to the free impulſe of humanity would imprint kiſſes on the inſtruments which have let out the life of his deareſt friend*. If his author does not reaſon juſtly in this place, why does he copy his indevout impertinences? If Mr. Berington approves his reaſoning, why does he permit the *inhuman* practice of imprinting kiſſes on the croſs on Good-Friday, to be continued in his chapel at Oſcott? As far as *humanity* is concerned, the modern emblem, or the original inſtrument can make but little difference; and if it be *inhuman* to kiſs the crucifix, certainly it cannot be philanthropic to gaze at it, to kneel and to pray before it. Theſe practices may even be called *new*; for though crucifixes have been often dug out of the tombs of the ancient martyrs, yet I believe there is no deciſive evidence, that the chriſtians expoſed them in their places of worſhip, much earlier than the era of Conſtantin and Helen. Perhaps Mr. Berington in this paſſage was only dazzled with a *new* idea, and knew not how to reſiſt the temptation of philoſophizing,

even at the risk of being told by bigots, that *he does not always reason justly.*

P. 44.—In this page Pope Urban is said to have conceived the project of the first crusade *on the spot*, upon hearing the relation of Peter the hermit, though in the two foregoing pages we were informed, that this very Urban and his predecessor Gregory planned this expedition upon *rational motives* of deep-sighted policy, and that the crusades *were not dictated by that wild enthusiasm to which they are generally ascribed.* This Pope Urban was a mischievous man, and he lived in the same age with Abeillard. Hence he is accused (p. 46.) of introducing *into the discipline of the church the innovation of plenary indulgences*, granted *for one single work of piety*, and of the *many abuses which followed* from it. The discipline of *commutation* of the penitentiary canons had indeed been creeping in *for more than two centuries, whereby whole years of penance might be redeemed in a few days*, and it is immediately added, that *pilgrimages to Rome, to Compostella, and to Jerusalem, entered into this system of commutation.* In the next edition of Abeillard (which will be the third) Mr. Berington will inform us, how in the eleventh century, when mail-coaches and post-horses were

were not in uſe, a pilgrimage to Rome, Compoſtella, and Jeruſalem could poſſibly be a work *of a few days*: he will alſo explain, how *the dreadful perils of war* in a long and tedious cruſade, *ſuperadded by Urban's new project to the meritorious exerciſe of a wandering life*, (p. 47.) could poſſibly conſtitute that *ſingle work of piety, for which Urban diſcharged ſinners* from the puniſhment due to their crimes. A cruſade *ſuperadded* to a pilgrimage, make, at the leaſt, *two works of piety*, and if either of them was faithfully and patiently performed, it might have inferred a ſeries of pious works, perhaps equivalent to all the rigour of the penitentiary canons. In expectation of this information, we will be ſatisfied to believe, that the church has a power of granting plenary indulgences, that the uſe of them is ſalutary to chriſtians, that this power was uſed long before the days of Urban, and that in the diſtribution of theſe ſpiritual grants, which have been ſometimes abuſed, the church is not abandoned by the Spirit of God.

P. 53.—In works of genius, epiſodes are contrived to illuſtrate the main ſubject, and critics expect that they ſhould riſe out of it. A man of Mr. Berington's genius is not to be fettered with common rules; but unleſs I tell

it,

it, my readers, who have not ſtudied this favorite work, will never ſuſpect, that the hiſtory of the cruſades, among other things, forms an epiſode to the ſcholaſtic diſputes and amours of Abeillard and Heloiſa. This happy pair then are ſtudying divinity at Paris, and we are ſcaling the walls of Jeruſalem. As ſoon as our hardy Palladins have atchieved their conqueſt and all oppoſition has ceaſed, *they turn themſelves to the holy ſepulchre*, ſays Mr. Berington, *they ſing anthems to their Saviour, they diſſolve in tears, and bear the appearance of every ſoft and tender emotion, with ſentiments of humiliation and contrition.* It is certainly very philoſphical to call all this *ſuperſtition and enthuſiaſm*; (ibid.) but it is not quite ſo philoſophical to inſtance it as *an inconſiſtency in human nature*, ſince it is very natural, that when men have attained a great object, they ſhould indulge the feelings which it is calculated to produce. In the caſe before us, the cruſaders' veneration for the holy ſepulchre was, by Mr. Berington's conceſſion, *founded in piety*, and what ſhould piety produce, but *humiliation* and *contrition*, eſpecially ſince the total defeat of their enemies had now rendered their ſwords uſeleſs? Could

not

not the ſyſtem of nerves have accounted for this?

P. 67.—*In the full blow of literary honours, the days of Abeillard flowed on in one unruffled ſtream, and the ſame tide brought wealth and glory with it.—Quid ſibi vult ſeminiverbius iſte? Act.* 17. He brings together three ſtrange metaphors, a flower, an unruffled ſtream, and a tide (which is generally ruffled) to convince us of the ſimple poſition, that "Abeillard lived in peace." Surely, I ſaid, theſe three things are full as inconſiſtent, as chriſtian devotion and martial ardour in the conquerors of Jeruſalem. What an intemperate uſe of rhetoric! what an injudicious ſelection of metaphors! Thus I was going on, when the very next ſentence informed me, that the famous *nervous ſyſtem, upon the tone of which all our animation depends, ſoon relaxes, when the ſpur is withdrawn, that excited its vibrations.* I excuſe him. His nervous ſyſtem muſt have been diſordered, when he wrote that ſentence; and if a *ſpur* is neceſſary to make it vibrate in proper tone, I hope he will have no reaſon to complain, that I have *withdrawn it.*

P. 104. contains a curious account of the origin of monaſtic inſtitutions. Mr. Berington pronounces, that *at leaſt in theſe degenerate*

*days,*

*days, we are diſpoſed to think that our Saviour* did not depart *ſufficiently from the common maxims and ways of ſociety.* The days are indeed degenerate, if Chriſtians can ſuppoſe, that their Redeemer departed at all from true maxims and ways of ſociety, of which his example was the brighteſt illuſtration. But monaſtic founders, it ſeems, were not ſatisfied with the perfection of Jeſus Chriſt. According to Mr. Berington, *they fancied that there were paths, which would lead them nearer* (than the paths of Jeſus Chriſt) *to the high perfection of angels, and theſe they reſolved to tread.* (Ibid.) If theſe men really preferred angels to the King of angels, then Mr. Berington is perfectly right in *believing their motives grounded on miſconceptions of duty.* The ſtudy, and ſtill more the practice, of their rules might however convince Mr. Berington, that Jeſus Chriſt was the object of theſe men's imitation, and his evangelical leſſons the rule which they followed. Perhaps Mr. Berington's account *is grounded on miſconceptions* of their motives, object and practice.

P. 131.—*Thoſe regions of happineſs, to which ſome Chriſtians, in too vain a partiality, pretend an excluſive right.* The Chriſtian's excluſive pretenſion to thoſe regions of eternal happi-

neſs

neſs is thought to be grounded on their Saviour's aſſurance, *unleſs a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghoſt, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* John iii. 5. If this partiality be vain, then vain is the declaration of him who has ſaid, *my words are ſpirit and life.* If this pretenſion be vain, then vain is the profeſſion of chriſtianity; the Jew and the Gentoo, the Mahometan and the Infidel, whom Mr. Berington invites *to ſit down by him in the ſunſhine of England, (State and Behav. p.* 186, *&c.)* may alſo take their ſeats by him in the regions of eternal happineſs as well as in this region of tranſient felicity. They will be happy here, as ſoon as church-eſtabliſhments are aboliſhed. The misfortune is, there is one religion eſtabliſhed in heaven, and it is not that of Jews, Gentoos, Mahometans or Philoſophers.

P. 133.—*He that looks for heterodoxy, will be ſure to find it.* He that looks for it in the Life of Abeillard, looks for trees in the foreſt. I have anxiouſly ſought for orthodoxy in it, but the profeſſors of it are throughout the objects of the author's averſion. He has leſs philanthropy for them, than for Jews, Gentoos, and Mahometans.

It is a trite obſervation, that diſputes on religion are generally conducted with more acrimony and unyielding perſeverance, than conteſts on any other object of human knowledge. Mr. Berington ſays, that *controverſy muſt be a little animated, (Reflect. p.* 99.) and of courſe, while he writes with gall againſt the *overweening orthodox*, he will not expect that they dip their pens in milk. Why do not men attack and defend religion with the ſame temper, and even good humour, with which they can diſpute upon matters of phiſophy, arts, or hiſtory? Not merely becauſe they conceive religion to be an object of higher excellence and importance; but becauſe no religious controverſy can exiſt, that does not wound the party, which happens to be wrong, in the paſſion deareſt to his heart, intellectual pride. In diſputes on ſcience, no pretenſions to infallibility are advanced; ingenuity and fancy have their full ſcope, the powers of the mind may play, till wearied with the ſport they yield by voluntary ſubmiſſion, or convert their energy to ſome new purſuit. In religion, you quickly arrive at the point where reaſon is checked; ſhe feels an inſuperable barrier to her exertions, the objects ſlide from her graſp, and he, who is beſt

beſt acquainted with the matter, appeals immediately to authority. His adverſary, if he be a nervous philoſopher, diſdains the imperious ſummons, he ſpurns the idea of ſubmitting to his equal, he pants *to range in freer fields, he throws his book from him in indignation*, he accuſes him of malevolence and *overweening orthodoxy*; he reproaches him *with conſtruing miſtakes into monſters, deviations from common language into heretical innovations*; whoever appeals to authority, will infallibly be upbraided with *ignorance, ſuperſtition, enthuſiaſm, and intolerance.* (See *Life of Abeillard*, p. 133, 134, *et paſſim.*) If the acknowledged judges pronounce an authoritative ſentence, the tolerant philoſopher will tell them, *that they have been animated in their enquiries by overweening orthodoxy, and arrogantly* miſtake *the baſe ſuggeſtions of their own minds, for the love of ſacred truth.* (P. 135.) The obvious and ſimple mode of exculpating the accuſed party by making a public profeſſion of faith, is diſdained as a *puerile taſk*, and Abeillard *is diſgraced and fallen*, as ſoon as he is required to recite the Athanaſian Creed. (P. 145.) The man who conſiders this as an humiliating trial, muſt ſurely want the humility of the goſpel, and may be ſuſpected as well as Abeil-

lard (p. 155.) *of loving himſelf better than he loves truth.* At all events, we may conclude with Abeillard's hiſtorian, that the man, who writes thus, *views the conduct of others, as it relates to himſelf, through ſo dark a medium, that he has not the power to form an equitable and candid judgment. Round his own perſon plays a bright and brilliant ſunſhine, which caſts light and amiability on every thought, every deſign, every undertaking, every action. So he fancies. Such is Abeillard's* hiſtorian. (Ibid.)

P. 156, 157.—*The perſecutions to which his* (Abeillard's) *doctrinal ideas expoſed him give a ſtrong portrait of the times; . . . . . but he, who, with ſome attention, has obſerved the real character even of the preſent times, will be ready to acknowledge, that if they are leſs intolerant, it is not becauſe either their principles or paſſions are different, but becauſe they dare not, or are aſhamed to profeſs them. The philoſophy of a few, the chriſtian moderation of others, the religious indifference of many, and the modiſh vices of more, have gained ſo much on the bigotry, the ſuperſtition, the falſe zeal, the fanaticiſm of the multitude, that he who dares to be intolerant is laughed at, and he, who would perſecute, is ridiculed. Yet what are the points which could ſo warm the breaſts of churchmen, and which in 1786, would*

*perhaps*

*perhaps communicate to the ſame order of men, an equal portion of holy fire, were the impediments removed, which I have mentioned? ..... They regard not the important worſhip of our Maker, nor the great intereſts of religion, nor the good of ſociety, nor moral worth, nor, &c. .... It has been ſaid, with ſome ſemblance of truth, that the holy Founder of the chriſtian ſyſtem, therefore expreſſed certain doctrines in ambiguous or myſterious language, that men, who, he knew, from variety of character, could never adopt unity in belief, might not indeed be free to think as they pleaſed, (for his language is ſufficiently perſpicuous,) but that, when they differed from one another, they might find indulgence. If ſuch was his intention, how much have we ſtriven to counteract the wiſe arrangement? ..... When our intereſt is engaged, or the buſineſs comes home to our own feelings, then, I conceive, we may be ardent .... but when the object conſtitutes a part of thoſe eſſential attributes, which the Deity has pleaſed to conceal from us, in the dark abyſs of his own infinitude; when he has not conſtituted us his delegates to repreſent his perſon, or to vindicate his rights, why are we arrogantly to erect a tribunal, and call our equals before it? He who has made us what we are would very willingly, I preſume, diſpenſe with the forwardneſs of our zeal,*

*zeal, and be more ſatisfied, that we .... left the things above that adminiſtration, the wiſdom and beneficence of which are beſt adapted to the important work.——Quis eſt iſte involvens ſententias ſermonibus imperitis? Job* 38. It is our philoſopher ſententiouſly arraigning the guardians of catholic faith as perſecutors, and loudly aſſerting his claim to unlimited toleration of error. Alas! why may error be refuted in every other ſcience, and in religion alone, to point it out, muſt he termed, *bigotry, ſuperſtition, falſe zeal and fanaticiſm?* The reaſon has been given; becauſe in religion authority has a right to ſpeak and to demand ſubmiſſion. When the pride of philoſophy refuſes it, religion anſwers, "Then you are not of mine. Behold my patent; it was ſigned in heaven; my deciſion is pronounced, it admits no reply. If you reſiſt it, my apoſtles and evangeliſts will call you ſeducers and enemies of Chriſt. They will reſpect your temporal rights, they will not tolerate your errors. You will inſult them as *bigotted, ſuperſtitious, fanatical* and *devoured with falſe zeal*; they will tolerate your outrages and pray for your converſion. Intolerant they will ever be of error, impatient of diviſion, becauſe unity conſtitutes the very

very eſſence of their divine ſcience, and he who alters the religion of Chriſt, divides Chriſt."

In fact, what does Mr. Berington mean? If he is a child of the catholic church, he cannot be ignorant that ſhe is the depoſitary of the revelation of God, and that heaven and earth ſhall ſooner paſs, than ſhe ſhall tolerate in ſilence the ſlighteſt alteration in her faith. Vainly does our philoſopher define, that the ſublime doctrines of the Trinity, which Abeillard impugned, *regarded not the worſhip of our Creator, the great intereſts of religion, or moral worth*; the Man-God who revealed them, beſt knew their connexion with theſe great ends; and as long as religion ſhall continue to be a perfect holocauſt of man to his Creator, ſo long will the church of Chriſt exact from her children, the perfect ſubmiſſion of their underſtanding to the incomprehenſible truths of God, as well as the conformity of their wills and hearts to his moral precepts. For ever ſhall the church reprobate novelty of doctrine, becauſe ſhe is eſſentially intolerant of error, as God is incapable of change; and when Mr. Berington ridicules this as bigotry and decries it as perſecution, he calumniates, he perſecutes his mother. In the paſſage

now

now under conſideration, he even joins his voice with the declared enemies of chriſtianity; for when he vainly triumphs in the defeat of eccleſiaſtical intolerance he aſcribes the victory *to the philoſophy of a few, the religious indifference of many, and the modiſh vices of more.* True it is, he joins *chriſtian moderation* to this conquering triumvirate; but it is one of thoſe incoherent aſſemblages of beings, which never met but in Mr. Berington's head, and cannot be found but in books. Chriſtian moderation does not make a common cauſe with *philoſophy, religious indifferency, and modiſh vice*; and while theſe three aſſociates combine to revile the catholic church, *chriſtian moderation* ſits at her helm, it guides every ſentence of her biſhops, it edifies in their patience, it inſtructs in their example; they ſteadily anathematiſe error, and mildly invite their ſtraying brethren to walk in the path of truth. The catholic church every where diſtinguiſhes the ſin from the ſinner, ſhe reprobates the one, ſhe admoniſhes, ſhe exhorts, ſhe ſeeks, ſhe tolerates the other. The principles of her biſhops are the ſame in every age, even by the confeſſion of Mr. Berington, and when he falſely aſſerts, *that they dare not profeſs them*, his own

conduct

conduct belies his words; for ſurely he would never have written two ſuch peeviſh pages againſt an enemy, whom he really believed to be too cowardly to reſiſt him. He thinks however, that modern churchmen would ſtill *catch the holy fire, if the impediments*, which he has mentioned, *were removed*, and theſe are, *philoſophy, indifference for religion, and modiſh vice.* Alas! can Mr. Berington think that God has made uſe of theſe three things as means to reform his church, to teach her the true ſpirit of toleration, to check the *over-weening orthodoxy* of her biſhops? The firſt of them, philoſophy, takes the lead in this page, and while it allows *men to be ardent where their own intereſt is engaged*, it preſumes to cenſure *the forwardneſs of their zeal*, when that of religion is concerned. Theſe men muſt be biſhops, becauſe biſhops were the perſons who had cenſured Abeillard's doctrines, and indeed no other perſons ever preſumed to decide upon the rectitude of religious tenets. They then are blamed by Mr. Berington, *for erecting a tribunal* and *calling their equals before it, though God has not conſtituted them his delegates*, and the objects of their judgment *be impenetrable to human reaſon, and as remote, as earth is from heaven.* They are even accuſed of *counteracting*,

*teracting*, by ſuch conduct, *the wiſe arrangement of Jeſus Chriſt.* What is this arrangement?

If we aſk Mr. Berington's biſhop, he will probably tell us, that this arrangement is written in the goſpel, that it eſtabliſhes him and his colleagues judges of revealed truths, that their tribunal has been open eighteen hundred years, that it has preſerved the words of life unaltered, that the merit of believing them here in the enigma, muſt precede the happineſs of ſeeing them hereafter in the blaze of revelation, that he who believes them ſhall be ſaved, he who diſbelieves them, condemned. What is this arrangement?

Mr. Berington and philoſophers tell us, that *the holy Founder of the chriſtian ſyſtem knowing that men never could adopt unity in belief* (alas, why then did Chriſt ſo earneſtly recommend and pray for an impoſſibility?) purpoſely *expreſſed his doctrines in ambiguous or myſterious language.* If the deſign of Chriſt had been to puzzle and lead us into error, he would, by this *arrangement*, effectually have accompliſhed ſuch a purpoſe, eſpecially ſince, as we have ſeen, *he has conſtituted no delegates, no tribunal* to expound the meaning of his *ambiguous and myſterious oracles.* Every man then

then muſt have expounded them, as he pleaſed;—No, ſays the philoſopher, even before he has cloſed his ſentence, theſe *ambiguous* and *myſterious* words *are ſufficiently perſpicuous; you are not therefore free to think as you pleaſe*, but theſe *ambiguous*, *perſpicuous*, *myſterious* words of Chriſt entitle you to *indulgence*, when you differ from other men. Glorious philoſophy! It makes bold demands on our *chriſtian moderation*, if it claims *indulgence* for this ſentence. But ambiguity and myſtery, he tells us, are the very grounds on which he claims it. We will then give it him, as ſoon as he can demonſtrate the credibility of his *myſterious* arrangement, as well as we have demonſtrated the divine miſſion of biſhops, and in the mean time we muſt beg of Mr. Berington to *indulge* us, while on this point of *arrangement* we preſume to *differ* from him and other philoſophical men.

I ſay *other philoſophical men*; not becauſe profeſſed philoſophers often agree with one another in ſyſtem or opinion, for mutual intolerance and incoherence of doctrine are the moſt decided features of their general character; but becauſe in the preſent age invention is almoſt gravelled in its attempt to diſcover new ſophiſms, and the moſt forward

champions are often reduced to the pitiful ſhift of filching from their predeceſſors, whoſe doctrines they ſtill profeſs to diſavow. Theſe plagiariſms are generally concealed beneath the variety of gaudy colours which rhetoric ſupplies; but when they are diveſted of their falſe garb, the fraud appears, and Mr. Berington ſtands ſuſpected of copying Rouſſeau. I do not deny that a caſual coincidence of ſentiment may ſometimes happen in two men, whoſe ruling paſſion is the luſt of ſingularity, but I will here ſubjoin an extract from Rouſſeau to help my readers to judge, whether the paſſage cited from *the Life of Abeillard* at the head of this article, be really an original production, or whether the ſurviving ſpirit of Rouſſeau magnetiſed Mr. Berington's nerves, when he penned it. Thus then muſes the philoſopher of Geneva. Emil. p. 139. 140. " *With all this, the ſame Goſpel abounds with incredible relations, with circumſtances repugnant to reaſon, and which it is impoſſible for a man of ſenſe either to conceive or admit. What is to be done amidſt all theſe contradictions? Be modeſt and circumſpect; regard in ſilence what cannot be either diſproved or comprehended, and humble thyſelf before the ſupreme Being, who only knows the truth..... Such is the involuntary ſcepticiſm*

in

*in which I remain: this ſcepticiſm however is not painful to me, becauſe it extends not to any eſſential point of practice; and as my mind is firmly ſettled regarding the principles of my duty, I ſerve God in the ſincerity of my heart. In the mean time I ſeek not to know any thing more than what relates to my moral conduct; and as to thoſe dogmas, which have no influence over the behaviour, and which many perſons give themſelves ſo much trouble about, I am not at all ſolicitous concerning them. I look upon, &c.*" It has been ſaid, that great geniuſes often meet. What is the *involuntary ſcepticiſm* of Rouſſeau, but a ſingle inſtance of Mr. Berington's general propoſition, *that men can never adopt unity of belief?* The only difference is, that Mr. Berington accounts for the impoſſibility on his favourite ſyſtem of nerves, for *true it is*, he obſerves, *we do not organize ourſelves, and happy are they, on whom nature ſmiled propitious in their birth. (Addreſs to Diſſ. p.* 32.) What is the Genevan philoſopher's acquieſcence in his ſcepticiſm, *which is not painful to him*, but the ſweet enjoyment of that *indulgence*, which Mr. Berington claims for all, who in articles of faith differ from the ſtandard of truth? The remaining parts of the two paſſages are

ſo

ſo very ſimilar, that one may paſs for an improved tranſlation or paraphraſe of the other. I need but add, that each is a laboured abridgment of the theological *muſings* of the reſpective authors; and as that of Rouſſeau was intended for a *coup de grace* to the goſpel, I muſt regret that a ſimilarity, either caſual or intentional, ſhould be diſcovered, between the moſt inconſiſtent of infidels, and a prieſt, who profeſſes to ſupport the chriſtian catholic cauſe.

P. 193.—The monaſtic life, inſtituted, as we have ſeen (p. 48.) to emulate *the perfection of angels, becauſe our Saviour did not ſufficiently depart from the common maxims and ways of ſociety*, is in this page deſcribed to conſiſt *of little actions and trifling incidents*, viz. *prayer, ſtudy, converſation*, and *retirement*; and it is added, that *amiable enthuſiaſm rather than divine grace, gives ſweetneſs to them*. Excepting prayer, I have read of theſe things as conſtituting the envied happineſs of philoſophers. Probably this feature of ſimilitude engaged Mr. Berington to give an excluſion to divine grace in the life of religious recluſes, and to ſubſtitute amiable enthuſiaſm in its place. How powerful is the magic of philoſophy! Elſewhere it couples enthuſiaſm with bigotry and

ſuper-

ſuperſtition, but can render it *amiable*, as ſoon as it is employed to exclude divine grace.

P. 272.—The accuſers of Abeillard are here repreſented as fired with *impoſing orthodoxy*, and adopting meaſures in ſupport of it, which *religion, reaſon and honour muſt ever view with diſguſt.* Truly *overweening* is Mr. Berington's zeal to cure this *orthodox* malady of churchmen, which neither his own *chriſtian moderation*, nor yet *philoſophy*, nor *indifference to religion*, nor even *modiſh vice* have yet been able to *melt down into philanthropy.* The accuſing bigots, whom he here undertakes to puniſh, are St. Bernard and William, the abbot of St. Thierry, the former of whom is firſt arraigned (p. 266.) for preſuming to diſapprove Abeillard's alteration of the Lord's prayer. It may however be imagined, that St. Bernard dreaded the progreſs of innovation, if it were tolerated in matters, which the church has ſubjected to her own regulation, though they do not perhaps immediately regard the integrity of faith. The order of the liturgy is of this nature, and though Abeillard and Mr. Berington think that *ſervile uniformity may generate diſguſt* (p. 268.) yet even

in

in the preſent age of religious freedom, no catholic prieſt can venture upon arbitrary changes in the public prayers, without incurring the imputation of raſhneſs, and expoſing himſelf to epiſcopal correction. In the long liſt of modern philoſophers, who have directed their talents *to the melting of bigotry*, I can find but two, who have thought of mending the Lord's prayer, Mr. Berington, and Ricci late biſhop of Piſtoia. The latter re-produced Abeillard's *ſuperſubſtantial* bread, and what was the conſequence? The good people of Piſtoia conceived, that the biſhop forbade them to aſk for temporal bleſſings in prayer, they were ſcandalized, and they continued with more earneſtneſs to beg their *daily* bread from God, as they had no hopes of obtaining any part of it from their biſhop.

P. 276. 278.—*The abbot of Clairvaux... warmed by an impetuous zeal, (which in holy men is the more danngerous, becauſe it is believed to be ſuggeſted by the Spirit of God,)... reſolved that violence ſhould try its efficacy...* he *uſes intemperate language... and the ſame means of defamation... Had Abeillard been guilty of more errors than were laid to his charge... ſtill is the worſt enemy of God or man to be treated with language*

ſo

*ſo foul, ſo inſulting, and ſo unchriſtian?.... But Abeillard, in truth, was not guilty of a ſingle error.....* St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, who cloſes the chain of ancient fathers, ſeems to have re-united the aggregate merits of them all. The ſanctity of his life, the ſtrength, the ſweetneſs, the copiouſneſs of his eloquence, his unbounded zeal, his labours for the purity of faith and reformation of manners, the prodigies by which heaven ſanctioned his miſſions, have ſecured to him the veneration and love of ſeven ages; and while we admire others, the life and the writings of St. Bernard will ever excite in chriſtians a peculiar affection for this amiable and wonderful man. In an age, which is called barbarous, though it produced St. Bernard, the melting pathos of his eloquence ſubdued the moſt obdurate ſinners; for in ſpite of the licentiouſneſs of the times, the chill of philoſophy had not yet frozen the hearts of men into apathy and indifference to the ſublimity of chriſtian virtue, recommended by the ſplendor of uninterrupted prodigies. Seven ages were yet to paſs, before the odious ſpirit of philoſophy was to ſpit its venom at the moſt unſullied virtue, and to depreciate the devout, the pathetic,

the ſweet St. Bernard into a defamer, a perſecutor, an impoſtor. His ſteady oppoſition to error has merited him this abuſe from Abeillard's hiſtorian, becauſe even a flaſh of philoſophy in a remote age, is a meteor which pleaſes more than the lamp of faith; and though it quickly vaniſhed before the blaze reflected from St. Bernard, its glimmering light is reproduced to bewilder thoſe, who chuſe to be led aſtray; and St. Bernard is a fanatic, becauſe the prototype of Mr. Berington muſt be a philoſopher. St. Bernard had much experience of the paſſions which generally actuate ſchiſmatical innovators, and he adapted his oppoſition to the characters of the men whom he encountered. A conſiderable part of his life was ſpent in theſe conteſts, and he generally found them incorrigibly contumacious; he knew, that under the pretext of reforming doctrine, they harboured the moſt outrageous ſpirit of revolt, and it generally burſt forth in maſſacres and plundering, in diſavowing all authority, and murdering the perſons who poſſeſſed it. Peter Bruys, Arnold of Breſcia, Henry of Thoulouſe, Tanchelm of Antwerp were equally enemies of church and of ſtate, they were public foes of mankind, levelling

was

was their principle, ſword and fire were the inſtruments of their apoſtleſhip. Bernard reſiſted them in all the power of ſanctity and eloquence, heaven ſuperadded ſigns; but Abeillard was a weak, timid, and conceited ſchoolman, and with him Bernard employed other weapons. Ravage and plunder entered not into the projects of a poor mutilated diſputant, he would have been ſatisfied with the credit of ſcholaſtic victories, nor would St. Bernard have interrupted his petty triumphs, if bowing to the deciſions of faith, he had confined his ſubtleties to the quibbles of dialect, and the vagaries of metaphyſic. But giddy with vanity he would pry into the depth of the divine eſſence, he would dogmatize on the trinity, and St. Bernard, who knew the dangerous conſequence of innovation, charitably intervened, to fetch down this meaſurer of majeſty to his proper level, before he ſhould be ſcorched by the glory of the divinity. *Qui ſcrutator eſt majeſtatis, opprimetur a gloria.* Mr. Berington's tenets were not yet known in the church, and St. Bernard believed, that *there are delegates conſtituted by God* to guard the purity of revelation, and to aſcertain and preach what he has been pleaſed to reveal of

his eſſence; he knew that theſe *delegates* of heaven are the biſhops of the church, and that the vain man had provoked him to appear before them. As he knew him to be untainted by the frantic ſpirit of other contemporary goſpellers, he conceived that he might ſubmit to a previous admonition, he kindly interpoſed it, and when it was rejected with inſolence and pride, he unwillingly conſigned the novel doctrines to the proper judges. Preſuming that Abeillard would quietly ſubmit to their deciſion, he declined the office of accuſer, and only by compulſion appeared in the council of Sens. "The biſhops," he modeſtly ſaid, "were the acknowledged judges, and a poor "monk was not wanting to enlighten them." The triumph of his eloquence was equal to the juſtice of his cauſe, and the vanity of Abeillard, who had anticipated the pleaſure of foiling the abbot of Clairvaux in diſputation, was properly and wholeſomely corrected. He ſtood abaſhed and confounded, he was huſhed, he could not anſwer *unum pro mille*, one word for a thouſand. The doctrines were condemned, the author of them was ſilenced, and by the prudence, the charity, the zeal of St. Bernard, a ſchiſm was prevented, which, under

der other leaders, might have ſplit the church and have deſolated the ſtate. Arnold of Breſcia, the ſcholar of Abeillard, exhibited the direful effects of innovation managed by ardent and impetuous tempers; but happily for the age, his maſter was only a vain coward. After this detail, I leave my readers to form a judgment of the decency of Mr. Berington's aſſertion, (p. 278.) that *St. Bernard's conduct towards Abeillard, is not to be juſtified on any principles of morality or honour*, and the peruſal of his letter to Innocent III. would enable them to determine, whether he deſerves from the pen of a catholic prieſt, the character of a *foul, inſulting and unchriſtian defamer.*

P. 278, 288.—*Abeillard, in truth, was not guilty of a ſingle error..... In his works might be found uncommon language, and ſome extraordinary opinions; heterodoxy there was none.... Nothing is ſo eaſy as to deſcry errors where you wiſh to find them; and this will ever be in the works and opinions of thoſe, who may only ſeem to diſſent from the multitude.* The guilt of Abeillard and the heterodoxy of Abeillard's doctrines are two things perfectly diſtinct. The latter is proved to demonſtration by the aſſertions of St. Bernard, by the evidence of the

the fourteen propoſitions which Mr. Berington reports, (p. 288.) by the deciſion of the council of Sens, by Pope Innocent's confirmation of it, and to balance this authority, the ſimple aſſertion of Mr. Berington is oppoſed. The judges, he ſays (p. 284.) *were convinced from the authorities of the ſcriptures and ancient fathers*, that theſe doctrines *were falſe and heretical*; their verdict was confirmed by the higheſt authority in the church, it has ſtood unimpeached for ages, and ſhall it be now rejected, becauſe the imitator of Abeillard complains, that *the orthodox will ever deſcry errors in the works and opinions of thoſe who ſeem to diſſent from the multitude?* St. Bernard denounced nothing but the errors of Abeillard, he demanded no perſonal chaſtiſement for the author of them, nor was any inflicted. Poſſibly he was not guilty of any error. The guilt of error is interiour, and he could not be condemned of perſonal error, becauſe he did not refuſe ſubmiſſion to his judges. But his doctrines were erroneous; and while, by the firſt principle of catholicity, they could not be viewed with indifference, his perſon was ſpared, he was even treated with the moſt tolerant charity, by Peter the venerable, one of

the

the firſt churchmen of the age. Far am I from pronouncing that Abeillard, or Abeillard's hiſtorian are reſpectively guilty of error, becauſe I know not their hearts. But I know from undoubted authority that the doctrines of the former were diſcordant from catholic truth, and though the writings of the latter appear to me to deviate ſtill farther from the known rule of orthodoxy, yet I do not preſume to pronounce it; I wait the deciſion of him, who is authorized to decide, and in the mean time I warn my brethren to beware of a man, who ſpeaks a language which they never heard from their old maſters in faith. This was the conduct of St. Bernard, and therefore Mr. Berington traduces him (p. 286.) as a malevolent declaimer, *aiming to vilify and render odious the name and principles* of his hero. He allows his *zeal* to have been *religious*, but then this is the moſt *impoſing* of all things, *when once it has paſſed thoſe limits, which reaſon, humanity, and the goſpel have oppoſed to its baneful ſpread.* We have ſeen, (p. 6.) that Mr. Berington treats as *bigotry* the religious zeal, which attempts *to give a ſpread to catholic religion.* He improves as he advances, and he here ſtigmatizes *religious*

*zeal*

*zeal as a baneful evil, the ſpread of which reaſon, humanity and goſpel* concur to oppoſe. (p. 287.) St Bernard's *religious zeal* endeavoured to ſtop *the ſpread* of falſe doctrine; in this he was intolerant, becauſe the goſpel is ſo. Mr. Berington is yet to ſhew us the limits, which the goſpel preſcribes to this *religious zeal.*

P. 287.—*How arbitrary are ſuch proceedings!* Mr. Berington here allows, that the Roman pontiff might condemn errors which had been previouſly condemned by a council; and in the ſame ſentence he calls this condemnation *eccleſiaſtical deſpotiſm.* What mercy may a biſhop expect, who ſhould cenſure any of Mr. Berington's doctrines? What proof is there that the pope had not ſeen the writings of Abeillard which he cenſured? Undoubtedly he knew the purport of them, and to confirm the ſentence of a council is a regular eccleſiaſtical procedure; but becauſe it cenſured a favorite, it is ſtiled *eccleſiaſtical deſpotiſm.*

P. 309. &c.—The hiſtory of the exceſſes of Arnold of Breſcia juſtifies St. Bernard's oppoſition to his maſter Abeillard; and yet the daring ſpirit of that ancient leveller *excites a*

*plea-*

*pleaſing admiration* in Mr. Berington, while he conſiders the power of the ſovereign pontiffs which that demagogue inſulted, as founded in uſurpation and abuſe. He laments that hiſtorians have drawn the character of this man in black colours; and becauſe his mind, like Arnold's, expands at the idea of humbling the pride of popes, he imputes the concurrent teſtimony of hiſtorians *to party, bigoted zeal and enthuſiaſm*, and at once pronounces Arnold's *character of mind to have been diſintereſted, generous, and benevolent.* On the ſame principle the abominations of Tanchelm of Antwerp are attributed to the prejudice of orthodox defamers, becauſe, according to Mr. Berington, (p. 311.) it is more probable that the orthodox ſhould be ſlanderers, than that fanatics and levellers ſhould be criminals. In this ſame page we are informed, that Tanchelm aſſumed an equality to Jeſus Chriſt. It is natural, at leaſt for chriſtians, to ſuſpect a man, who can proceed to ſuch a ſtrain of blaſphemous impiety; and unleſs Mr. Berington's ſpite againſt the orthodox were indeed exuberant, he would ſurely have had the judgment to reſerve his ſarcaſms againſt them to ſome other occaſion. It was not wonderful,

that a man of Tanchelm's character ſhould end by a violent death, though religion has always condemned the unauthoriſed deſtroyers of even the moſt outrageous miſcreants. But becauſe the murderer of Tanchelm was a prieſt, he is ſarcaſtically ſtiled *good*, to intimate, that orthodox prieſts regard homicide as lawful, when it can deliver them from their oppoſers.

P. 313. 314. *&c.*—Mr. Berington extenuates the crimes of theſe wild reformers from the conſideration, *that their leading object was to inſult and vilify the prieſthood, whoſe zeal had unſheathed the magiſtrates' ſword againſt them*, and this, he thinks, explains, why *they attacked with peculiar virulence the adminiſtration and efficacy of the ſacraments, the ceremonies of the church, prayers for the livinng and the dead, the order of prieſthood, the Lord's ſupper, and the authority of the firſt paſtors of the church. All intolerance*, in Mr. Berington's ſyſtem, *is unchriſtian*; it is therefore reaſonable to depreciate the prieſts, whoſe *unchriſtian* zeal withſtood the progreſs of theſe reformers, and while their exceſſes are imputed to the ſlanders of the orthodox, their clerical opponents are deſcribed as men *corrupted by ſimony and debaſed by concubinage*, by whoſe

whoſe fault *the momentous truths of religion and morality were ſunk in idle ceremony and vile ſuperſtition.* They were *proud and uſeleſs miniſters*, and the only alledged proof of the juſtice of this deſcription, is, that they had not yet adopted Mr. Berington's ſyſtem of univerſal toleration, and that they conceived it a duty to reſiſt reformers, who *with peculiar virulence attacked the ſpiritual authority of the church, her ſacraments, her practices, her prayers, her temples, her altars, who tortured, and by threats and blows forced her miniſters (debaſed by concubinage) to take wives or to periſh in dungeons.* The foremoſt and moſt ſucceſsful of theſe *intolerant, proud and uſeleſs miniſters* was St. Bernard, and while others are accommodated with one general character of ſimony, concubinage, pride and inutility, the Abbot of Clairvaux is ſtigmatized with *peculiar virulence*, his intolerance, his malice, his ſpite, his jealouſy, his ignorance, his enthuſiaſm, his intemperance, his unchriſtian language glow through an hundred pages, and every where *diſguſt* Mr. Beton's *honour*, *reaſon*, and *religion*. (p. 272.) Mr. Berington may fancy that he has painted the reformers of the eleventh century and the oppoſers of theſe reformers; he has, without

knowing it, much more ſucceſsfully delineated himſelf. Modern biſhops muſt not expect a ſupporter of their authority, nor modern catholics of their religion, in a man, who, had he lived in the eleventh age, might have ſided with the *diſintereſted generous and benevolent* Arnolds, Tanchelms and Bruys, againſt the biſhops of the church, and their *unchriſtian* champion St. Bernard.

P. 351.—*Rome was much agitated by the preaching of Arnold of Breſcia.... The popes were often obliged to retire from Rome. It was not at once that the people could be induced to ſubmit to their unnatural juriſdiction, &c.* This Arnold of Breſcia is a ſpecial favorite with Mr. Berington. He was a ſcholar of Abeillard, and he directed all his *generous* and *diſintereſted* efforts to pull down the pope. He was the Kniperdolling, the John Knox, the George Gordon of his age. Mr. Berington calls the pope's juriſdiction *unnatural*. If he ſpeaks of his ſpiritual juriſdiction, it was not indeed *natural*; it was *ſupernatural*, derived from heaven and divine. If he means it of his temporal dominion within his own ſtates, it was ſurely natural, that the people ſhould ſubmit to a government, the duration of which

was

was meaſured by ages, of which no abuſe is produced, to juſtify a revolution, or to excuſe the crime of Arnold from *unnatural* rebellion. Sober men will admit the pope's temporal dominion in the eccleſiaſtical ſtate to be righteous, as founded on donation, or purchaſe, and the voluntary ſubmiſſion of the people. Every argument that may be thought to infringe it, will weaken the foundations of every other monarchy in chriſtendom. Mr. Berington flaming with the true Gallic ſpirit, decides, *that the inſignia of worldly grandeur belong not to the Roman pontiff, that it was the intereſt of the European princes to eſpouſe the cauſe* of his dear Arnold; and he complains, *that theſe very princes and even the people of Rome, were themſelves the greateſt ſupport of the pope's unchriſtian power, as ſoon as the paroxyſm of good ſenſe,* which excited Arnold's rebellion, *was over.* In the very next ſentence, by a ſtrange paroxyſm in Mr. Berington's nerves, this *good ſenſe,* which engaged them to oppoſe papal power, is declared to have been *paſſion and teſtineſs of humour rather than conviction of its inexpediency*; and in ſpite of their *good ſenſe* they remained unconvinced of its inexpediency, becauſe *they were ignorant of their*

*own*

*own rights*, uninformed of the real principles of chriſtianity, and were beſides *ſo baſely ſuperſtitious, that the mere threat of excommunication diſarmed their juſteſt fury, and reduced them to ſubmiſſive penitence.* If Mr. Berington had been born to enlighten the eleventh age, he would have kept alive in a perpetual glow *the good ſenſe of paſſion, teſtineſs and juſt fury*, which then only appeared in paroxyſms, and he would have effected it by demonſtrating, that the ſpiritual juriſdiction and temporal dominion of the ſovereign of Rome are equally *unchriſtian*, and that it is baſe ſuperſtition to dread excommunication, when denounced againſt murderers of prieſts and deſpoilers of altars and churches, Had he illuſtrated remote ages, little would have been left for the modern Arnolds of the Gallic aſſembly, who having renounced the principle of conqueſt, have yet had the *good ſenſe* to reſerve *their paſſion, teſtineſs of humour, and juſt fury, to tear from the Pope his unchriſtian inſignia of worldly grandeur* at Avignon, where in the murder of prieſts, the plundering of churches, the maſſacre of faithful ſubjects, and the transferring of dominion they have atchieved every thing, that Mr. Berington regrets to have been left

undone

undone by their predeceſſors in the eleventh century. He has however the glory of having taken the lead of the reformers at Avignon, in laying down the true chriſtian catholic principles of due ſubmiſſion to ſpiritual and temporal power; he has only to regret, that the narrow-minded prieſts of Great Britain, himſelf excepted, will, to a man, diſavow his great principle, *that the government which is beſt inclined to give us protection, has the only right to demand our allegiance.* (*State and Behav. p.* 43.) Courage Mr. Berington; you have told us, that in the buſineſs of reformation, *oppoſition ſhould give a ſpring to your exertions.* (*Reflect. p.* 21.)

P. 352.—This curious page contains a flattering commendation of the French nation, becauſe they deſpiſed the behaviour of the Pope, whom Arnold drove from his capital, and *pitied the errors into which the falſe maxims of his court had impelled him, nay even applauded the oppoſition of his enemies.* The only *falſe maxims* of the Pope which Mr. Berington exhibits, are, the maintaining of eſtabliſhed ſovereignty, and the excommunicating outrageous murderers and levellers; and the only proof which he alledges that the

French

French condemned them, is, that they gave a ſecure aſylum to the exiled pontiff, and that *on every occaſion they ſtood foremoſt to protect the perſons, to obey the inſtructions, and to ſupport, at their own expence, the ſplendour* of the popes of Rome. Ordinary readers, untinged with philoſophy, will be apt to conclude from theſe proofs, that the French, in that age, rather condemned the Beringtonian principle of diveſting popes of their power, that they had not yet found out that this power was *unchriſtian*, or that the *fury* of the Arnoldiſts *was juſt*. If Mr. Berington had wiſhed to ſhew that the French conceived the Pope to be injured by his friend Arnold, what other proof could he have brought? His logic is as ſound as his loyalty.

P. 348.—*That being, indubitably, is the moſt perfect, which anſwers beſt to the deſigns of its creation. Why, or for what end, we were made, is a point, not ſo eaſily perhaps to be decided.* Mr. Berington, who has been ſo long undermining our catechiſm, here ſubverts one of the firſt principles and earlieſt documents which it conveys. He informs us in direct terms, that it is not eaſy to know, why and for what end we are created. To ordinary chriſtians,

tians, untutored in philoſophy, the concealment of this great purpoſe muſt appear inconſiſtent with the bounty of the Creator, who has enjoined us ſo many moral duties, and it muſt of courſe ſlacken the ardour of our obedience, whenever they happen to claſh with our inclinations, intereſts or paſſions. Few men will labour through painful exertions of virtue, if, ignorant of the end and purpoſe of them, they cannot diſcern Hope ready to reward their toils. But as we conceive moral, and even chriſtian virtues to be of ſome avail, we beg leave to expreſs our theological intolerance of Mr. Berington's doctrine on this point, and to be allowed the old belief of our catechiſm, that *we are created to know, love, and ſerve God in this world, and to be happy with him for ever in the next.*

P. 69.—It is well for us, that Mr. Berington, in his Eſſay on Sunday Schools, p. 34. has not reprobated this document of our catechiſm as *incoherent, undefined,* and productive of *confuſion of ideas, and inſtability of belief,* as much as that other, which informs the child, that *his ſoul is like to God, becauſe it is a ſpirit endowed with underſtanding and free-will, and is immortal.*

Mr. Berington's reaſoning and inferences are admirable. Becauſe he has forgotten his catechiſm, and cannot determine *why or for what end he was made*, he concludes that *he is free to chuſe his own ſtate of life*, and that, *though the life of recluſes be ſelfiſh, yet a few of them may be allowed*, for this good reaſon, *becauſe there is ſo little real virtue among thoſe, who talk moſt of philanthropy and ſocial kindneſs.* (P. 348.) I believe Mr. Berington would have been free to chuſe his ſtate of life, even though he had chanced to know the end of his creation. If religious recluſes were ignorant of it, they would indeed have little reaſon to forego the comforts and proſpects of ſocial life; though I muſt here acknowledge, that the company and diſcourſe of thoſe men, who talk much of *philanthropy*, is peculiarly diſguſting, and is alone almoſt enough to drive one from ſociety. But whether our recluſes retire into ſolitude, to practiſe evangelical counſels, or merely to avoid the company of philanthropiſts, Mr. Berington would ſtill leave *the doors of their convents open, becauſe an improper uſe is often made of their locks and bars; but he would not compel any to go out, who preferred the retirement of a cloiſter, to the wide expanſe of heaven.* (*Ibid.*) This indeed

indeed is kind, but Mr. Berington is not called to frame ſtatutes for nuns, and his reform will hardly be engrafted upon any monaſtic rule. Abbeſſes, who have ſtudied his favorite work, and recollect the adventures of Father Abeillard and Mother Heloiſa in the refectory at Argenteuil, (p. 455.) may be ſurpriſed to ſee Mr. Berington appear in public in ſuch company, but they will not ſurrender to him their locks, their bolts and their bars. If they are uſeleſs for the confining of nuns, they are of importance for the excluding of Abeillards from their refectories and cells. They may even be ſerviceable to ſequeſter Heloiſas during *ſome years of holy retirement*, after which, Mr. Berington may call them forth to exerciſe *miſſionary powers, in the wide expanſe of heaven, (State and Behav. p.* 182.) eſpecially if their Abeillards have previouſly inſtructed them in the *valuable rights* of miſſioners, and the *juriſdiction which they have independent of the See of Rome, (ibid. p.* 151.) and of courſe much above the reach of epiſcopal authority. Mr. Berington is a tolerant philoſopher; he will not be angry that I tell him my opinion.

P. 367.—*The account of the miracles which he* (St. Bernard) *is ſaid to have worked . . . . is*

*truly aſtoniſhing . . . I cannot perſuade myſelf to believe, that heaven could have ſo manifeſtly interfered to promote a ſcheme at once ſo extravagant in itſelf, and which was to end ſo diſaſtrouſly. Bernard, religious, honeſt, conſcientious, as he was, could not poſſibly have engaged in a ſettled plan of deception. I would rather think, he was himſelf impoſed on; and that theſe extraordinary facts were really no more than the common effects of a heated imagination, aided by ignorance and enthuſiaſm.* Whoever reads Mr. Berington, muſt not ſtartle at contradictions. The man, who has abandoned ſound principles, never yet aſſumed others, that were conſiſtent. Mr. Berington affects the popular credit of mocking at popiſh miracles, and this vulgar topic helps him to depreciate the great St. Bernard, whom the ſtream of hiſtory has brought down to us, as the thaumaturge of his age. His narration preſents the ſaint as a crafty impoſtor, adapting his tricks to the character of the fools, whom he wiſhed to cheat; and obſerving, that eloquence little *moved the cool and phlegmatic Germans*, he found that *other means muſt be uſed*, and he reſolved *to addreſs them with ſigns and wonders.* (P. 366.) The choice of the means is ſtill ſuppoſed to remain with the ſaint, and his diſcretionary

uſe

uſe of miracles muſt leave with the reader a ſtrong perſuaſion of juggling, mummery, and deception. No other idea will be formed of a man, whoſe conduct has been already pronounced inexcuſable *on any principles of honour or morality*; (p. 278.) and if Bernard in this page be acknowledged to be *honeſt, conſcientious, and incapable of engaging in a ſettled plan of deception*, it is but one of Mr. Berington's uſual inconſiſtencies, which affords him an opportunity of explaining the ſaints' recorded prodigies on the conſiſtent principles of modern philoſophy. Though St. Bernard be evidently held forth as a wonder-monger, and *his conduct be unjuſtifiable on principles of honour and morality*, yet becauſe he is *religious, honeſt and conſcienttous*, Mr. Berington decides, that his ſuppoſed miracles were *the common effects of a heated imagination, aided by ignorance and enthuſiaſm*. Are inſtantaneous cures of deſperate illneſſes the *common* effects of heated imaginations and ignorance? If a heated imagination could alone do the work, I know to whom the crowd of patients would reſort. It would have been more plauſible to impute the ſuppoſed prodigies to the impoſture of Bernard's hiſtorians; but Mr. Berington would then have loſt the credit of explaining them,

them, by making St. Bernard *an ignorant and hot-headed enthuſiaſt.* The miracles are certainly imaginary, becauſe, ſays the philoſopher, heaven could not interfere to promote a ſcheme, (the cruſade) *which was extravagant in itſelf, and was to end diſaſtrouſly.* Why was the ſcheme extravagant? Mr. Berington has told us, that the firſt cruſade was planned on principles of deep-ſighted policy, (p. 42.) Is Mr. Berington acquainted with all the views religious and political, of thoſe who undertook it? Does he know the final cauſes, for which God permitted it? Is he ſure, that theſe cauſes were ſuch, as muſt exclude the miraculous intervention of heaven, to forward the plan? Could not God grant miracles to ſupport a cauſe, which was to fail of the primary end, which man propoſed? Did not God, by a miraculous voice, call forth the bands of Iſrael to fight againſt Benjamin, by whom they were thrice diſcomfited? Might not an expedition, ſanctioned by miracles, fail, through the faults of individuals, as Joſuah's war againſt Hai was unſucceſsful through the ſingle crime of one man? Philoſophers are not the counſellors of the Almighty, to determine when and why he ſhall derogate from nature's laws. Were they not

continually

continually inverted in Iſrael by the Redeemer and his apoſtles, to convince the Jews of the divinity of the Son of God, which they ſtill refuſed to adore, with the obſtinacy of modern ſectaries, whom Mr. Berington calls *wiſe?*

Myſteries and miracles are the terror of philoſophers. At no period were miracles *more frequent*, than during the life of our Redeemer and of his apoſtles; and Mr. Berington inform us (p. 185.) that *ignorance, ſuperſtition, bigotry, and enthuſiaſm moſt clearly attended the progreſs of miraculous operations, through that ſeries of years, when their appearance was thought to be moſt frequent.* He adds, *that they have ceaſed to happen, ſince the clouds of ignorance have* (been) *diſperſed, and religion has been purified from the baſe allay of human opinions.* The variety of ſects and doctrines, which exiſts, ſeems to prove, that religion is even now allayed with human opinions; and the indiſcriminate imputation of *ignorance* to paſt ages, does not perhaps ſo much prove the ſuperior knowledge, as the philoſophical vanity of our own. Our philoſopher in the height of his ſcience, is confident, that, if God had really indulged miracles to the cloudy ages, which he contemns, he would

not

not now withhold them from theſe lightſome days, *when mankind is beſt able to appreciate his ſyſtems, and moſt diſpoſed to honour them.* (Ibid.) With what face can Mr. Berington aſſert this diſpoſition *to honour modern miracles* in philoſophers, who deride all thoſe which are atteſted by antiquity? Does not Rouſſeau declare, that he would not have believed the reſurrection of Lazarus, if he had ſeen him ſtart from his grave? Is there a miracle of ancient ages, which, if renewed in our own, Mr. Berington would not attribute to the remnants of *unmelted bigotry and narrow fancies*, with as much plauſibility, as he now undervalues the teſtimony, which the eleventh age has given to the wonderful works of St. Bernard? In the language of Dr. Square *, he talks wiſely of *the eternal fitneſs of things*, and eſtabliſhes himſelf judge of the *criſis, when a ſubverſion of the divine harmony of ſyſtem ſhall intervene.* (P. 184.) He cannot diſcover this criſis in the miracles of what he is pleaſed to call the *dark ages*; and becauſe God grants few miracles to modern pride, which deems itſelf *beſt able to appreciate his ſyſtems*, he concludes that the humble St. Bernard could not

* Preceptor to Tom Jones.

be

be more favoured, and that his miracles were *the common effects of a heated imagination, aided by ignorance and enthuſiaſm.*

*Miracles*, ſays Mr. Berington, *have ceaſed to happen*; but does he aſſign the true cauſe? They are, undoubtedly, more rare than in days of old, and the reproach may ſtand againſt our philoſophic age, that *unleſs they ſee ſigns and prodigies*, they will not believe. *They have Moſes and the prophets*; but if, with Mr. Berington, they deny the *conſtituted delegates* of God, (p. 157.) neither would they believe St. Bernard, if he ſhould return to life with the miraculous powers, which aſtoniſhed the eleventh century. Why are miracles become ſo rare? Jeſus went to Nazareth, *and he wrought not many miracles there, becauſe of their unbelief*; Mat. xiii. 58. or, as another evangeliſt tells it, in terms ſtill more expreſſive, *he could not do any miracles there, only that he cured a few that were ſick*, Mark vi. 5. as if his omnipotence had found an obſtacle in their haughty incredulity. It would ſeem, that theſe cures, in ſmall number, are the only extraordinary ſigns, that God grants to the arrogant incredulity, which infects the preſent age. Look round the church, you may ſtill find a few invalids re-eſtabliſhed; other mi-

racles are denied, as the prodigy of deſcending from the croſs was refuſed to the haughty Phariſees and Scribes, who, after a ſeries of wonders and verified predictions, preſumed to fix upon that, as the teſt of their ſubmiſſion. But Jeſus expired, and left them reviling the miracles, which they had heard and ſeen, and demanding another, which they would equally have diſbelieved. Had he deſcended from his croſs, they would have talked of ſorcery, or perhaps of *animal magnetiſm*, or of ſome ſly art *of reſuſcitating dying perſons*, both which Mr. Berington compares, or prefers to the atteſted miracles of St. Bernard. (P. 185.)

I truſt that Mr. Berington will not here tell me, that I compare the miracles of St. Bernard with thoſe of our Redeemer. I mean only to compare the attacks which have been made upon both, by their reſpective enemies. In fact Mr. Berington ſeems to have done little more, than to pick up the blunted weapons of Rouſſeau; and though I will not again ſoil my page with the ſophiſms of that unbeliever, whoever chuſes to confront Mr. Berington's reaſonings, on this ſubject, with *p.* 109 & *ſqq.* of Emilius (Edit. Lond. 1763) will eaſily diſcover a ſimilarity between

between the two philoſophers, that can hardly be called accidental.

But what is the general ſentiment of Catholics on this ſubject of miracles, ſo favorite a topic with their philoſophical enemies? They believe the prophecy, by which Chriſt foretold, that his faithful followers ſhould do works even greater than his own, John xiv. 12.; they view with diſguſt the laboured affectation of philoſophers to overturn the credit of all recorded prodigies; they think that the authenticity of any individual miracle muſt depend upon the external motives of credibility, which attend it; and when theſe are unexceptionable, they will believe the wonder, though perhaps they cannot diſcover the particular final cauſe, for which it is permitted. When I read of a miracle, the ſtrangeneſs of the fact is not the object of my diſcuſſion; I ſtudy the proofs which are offered, and if theſe ſatisfy me, I know that one miracle is as eaſy to omnipotence as another. If the hiſtory of the adventures of Tobias were diveſted of all its motives of credibility, and ſuppoſed to have been firſt related by the author of the Golden Legend, it would appear incredible, though we now revere it as divinely true. With equal reſpect I read the

hiſtory of a troop of devils entering into a herd of ſwine and hurrying them into the ſea, though I know as little of the final cauſe of this prodigy, as Mr. Berington knows of the cauſe for which the miracles attributed to St. Bernard were permitted; but if upon examination I ſhall find theſe prodigies credibly atteſted, I will not reaſon ſo pitifully as to reject them, becauſe they are miracles; much leſs will I call the ſaint an *ignorant enthuſiaſt*, becauſe Mr. Berington thinks the ſecond cruſade an *extravagant* project, or becauſe it ended in diſaſter.

I am tired of Abeillard; my readers may be tired of me. It is time to part. Enough has been ſaid to create a miſtruſt of the public invitation, which Mr. Berington holds out to us, to *reſiſt* the ſpiritual government of our venerable ſenior biſhop. If this daring meaſure be impartially conſidered with reference to the principles and doctrines, which have been here reviewed, it ſurely cannot be, that any catholic clergyman will countenance it with his approbation: may not even a well grounded hope be indulged, that when the few reverend gentlemen, who have lent their names to Mr. Berington, ſhall come to conſider *the eternal fitneſs of things and the divine*

*harmony*

*harmony of ſyſtem*, they will no longer ſubmit to be dandled by a philoſopher, whom the weakeſt of them would eaſily overthrow? However incompatible with catholic principles his doctrines may appear, he will probably tell us, that, like Abeillard, *he is not guilty of a ſingle error*. (P. 278.) I am willing to admit the excuſe, becauſe guilt in this matter can be aſcertained only by reſiſtance to lawful authority, and Mr. Berington may poſſibly deteſt as ſincerely, as I do, the errors which diſfigure his works. They are not however the leſs contagious on this account, and I truſt, that when lawful authority ſhall require it, he will edify us by a public retractation of whatever his biſhop may judge to be offenſive to the faith, the piety, and the loyalty of his catholic brethren. To pronounce judgment on theſe matters is the undoubted right of his biſhop, and when He is named, I can only repeat the words, which St. Bernard wrote to Pope Innocent on the errors of Abeillard, *ſufficere ſcripta ejus ad accuſandum eum, nec meâ referre ſed epiſcoporum, quorum eſt miniſterii de dogmatibus judicare* *. However much modern prelates edify the church by

* S. Bern. ep. ad Innoc. de error. P. Abbaill.

forbear-

forbearing to diſplay the ancient ſeverity of cenſures, they ceaſe not to aſſume the paſtoral language of primitive times, by warning the faithful, whenever any attempt is made to ſpread the contagion of new doctrines. When they point out the danger, we cling around them, we tolerate the authors of innovation, but we reject and avoid their principles. The declaration of the firſt See in the late Briefs of Pius VI has at once reunited the venerable biſhops of France, and they have anſwered their chief paſtor, as the ancient biſhops of Gaul wrote to St. Leo, that his letter to Flavian againſt the errors of Eutyches had filled their churches with joy, and enabled each one to declare his faith with freedom and confidence; ... *Jure lætantur .... datamque ſibi occaſionem gaudent, quâ libere et fiducialiter ... eloquantur, et aſſerat unuſquiſque quod credit* *. On the other hand St. Bernard writing to Pope Innocent on the heretical doctrines of Abeillard, aſſerts, that this innovator grew daring, becauſe his book was not diſcountenanced at Rome, and he urges the condemnation of it, becauſe the author drew many after him and found perſons who believed and

* Labbe, t. 4. col. 378.

abetted

abetted his erroneous tenets. *Hæc gloriatio hominis illius, quod liber ſuus in curia Romana habet, ubi caput reclinet..... Quia ergo ille multitudinem trahit poſt ſe, et populum, qui ſibi credat, habet, neceſſe eſt, ut huic contagio celeri remedio occurratis* *. In the caſe of Abeillard's hiſtorian, to uſe his own words, *I ſee ſufficient motives for not referring the cauſe to the Roman court, and it is moreover my opinion, that denunciations and appeals ſhould not take that direction, unleſs in caſes of extreme neceſſity* †. In the preſent inſtance, the word of his own biſhop is abundantly ſufficient to redreſs the miſchief, and to Him with confidence I addreſs the earneſt entreaty, which St. Bernard preferred to Pope Innocent in the cauſe of Abeillard, *Capite nobis, pater amantiſſime, vulpes quæ demoliuntur vineam domini, donec parvulæ ſunt; .... quamquam non jam parvulæ, nec pauculæ, ſed certe grandiuſculæ et multæ ſunt* ‡. With this confidence and in this conviction, I denounce to the right reverend Father in God, Thomas, Biſhop of Acon, and Apoſtolical Vicar in the midland diſtrict, the following works and propoſitions extracted from

* Ep. 191. † Appeal to, &c. p. 19.

‡ Ad Innoc. ubi ſupra.

them,

them, as grievouſly ſuſpected of being ſeverally and reſpectively unſound in faith, injurious to the ſpiritual ſupremacy of the Head of the church and to the ſpiritual authority and juriſdiction of biſhops, ſubverſive of the principles of our allegiance to his Majeſty and our country, hurtful to eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, diſreſpectful to the holy father and doctor of the church St. Bernard, favouring novelty, ſcandalous, and offenſive of pious ears, viz.

"The State and Behaviour of Engliſh Catholics, from the Reformation to the year 1780. With a view of their preſent number, wealth, character, &c. In two parts. London: Printed for R. Faulder, New-Bond Street, M,DCC,LXXX."

"Reflections addreſſed to the Rev. John Hawkins. By the Rev. Joſeph Berington. Birmingham: Printed by Mr. Swinney, M,DCC,LXXXV."

"The Hiſtory of the Lives of Abeillard and Heloiſa; compriſing a period of eighty four years, from 1079 to 1163: with their genuine letters from the collection of Amboiſe. By the Rev. Joſeph Berington. Birmingham: Printed by M. Swinney, M,DCC,LXXXVII."

"An

" An Addreſs to the catholic clergy of England, by their brethren of the county of Stafford. Printed by Swinney and Walker. M,DCC,XCII."

" An Appeal to the catholics of England, by the catholic clergy of the county of Stafford. Wolverhampton. Printed by J. Smart, M,DCC,XCII."

And eſpecially the following propoſitions, extracted from the mentioned works, becauſe *grandiuſculæ ſunt.*

1. " I am not aſhamed to ſay, that the government, which is beſt inclined to give us protection, has the only right to demand our allegiance." *State and Behaviour of Engliſh Catholics, p.* 43.

2. " Theſe connexions with France were of the moſt fatal tendency, and the royal brothers, with all their miniſters, deſerved to loſe their heads." *Ibid. p.* 57.

3. " We maintain, that each paſtor in his pariſh, each biſhop in his dioceſe, each metropolitan in his province, and each patriarch in his nation, is poſſeſſed of a proper and eſſential juriſdiction, wholly uncontroulable by, and independent of, the ſee of Rome." *Ibid. pages* 153, 154.

4. "I cannot say, whether it would be better, that this discipline (ecclesiastical celibacy) of our church were repealed: perhaps it might." *Reflections to the Rev. J. Hawkins, p.* 8.

5. "I am an enemy to church-establishments.... their soil, I fear, is not favourable to the growth of truth." *Ibid. p.* 26.

6. "What liberty of discussion, or, if you will, of doubting, does any christian possess, that we have not?" *Ibid. p.* 31.

7. "The God that made me, has given me something, which *perhaps* he has not given to the ox or the elephant, and this man calls *reason*." *Ibid. p.* 33.

8. "What very extraordinary co-operation (of the divine spirit) is required, that men, habituated to the concerns of religion, should be able to declare, what doctrine they were taught, and what they then believe?—And this is that wondrous *infallibility*, about which reams of paper have been written, that would more than cover the whole surface of the globe!" *Ibid. p.* 68.

9. "He (the Pope) has indeed his *prerogative*, but we have our privileges, and are independent on him, excepting where it has pleased

pleaſed the community, for the ſake of unity and good order, to ſurrender into his hands a limited ſuperintendance." *Ibid. p.* 69.

10. "And he (Abeillard) dares to give them (the ancient philoſophers) a ſeat of happineſs in thoſe regions, to which, ſome Chriſtians, in too vain a partiality, pretend an excluſive right." *Hiſtory of the Lives of Abeillard and Heloiſa, p.* 131.

11. "View them (the doctrines on the Trinity) abſtractedly, as they are generally conſidered, and it will be found, that they regard not the important worſhip of our Maker, nor the great intereſts of religion, nor the good of ſociety, nor our own improvement in virtue, juſtice and piety. *Ibid. p.* 156.

12. "When he (the Deity) has not conſtituted us his delegates, to repreſent his perſon, or to vindicate his rights; why are we arrogantly to erect a tribunal, and call our equals before it? He who has made us what we are, would very willingly, I preſume, diſpenſe with the forwardneſs of our zeal, and be more ſatisfied, that we lived as men, in the improvement of our own natures, and left the things above to that adminiſtration, the wiſ-

dom and beneficence of which are beſt adapted to the important work. *Ibid. p.* 157.

13. " The ſame means of defamation he (St. Bernard) uſed at home, decrying the principles and perſon of Abeillard, and holding up both to the ridicule and deteſtation of the whole French church. Upon what principles of morality or honour this conduct of Bernard can be juſtified, I know not. Had Abeillard been guilty of more errors than were laid to his charge, and had his behaviour been reprehenſible, as he deſcribed it; ſtill is the worſt enemy of God or man to be treated with language ſo foul, ſo inſulting, and ſo unchriſtian? But Abeillard, in truth, was not guilty of a ſingle error." *Ibid. p.* 278.

14. " Thus did Bernard, true to his own character and to the views of the aſſembly (the council of Sens) aim to vilify and render odious to the Roman court the name and principles of the man. (Abeillard.).... So intolerant and ſo impoſing even on the beſt minds, is religious zeal, when once it has paſſed thoſe limits, which reaſon, humanity, and

and the goſpel have oppoſed to its baneful ſpread." *Ibid. pages* 286. 287.

15. " Why or for what end we were made, is a point, not ſo eaſily perhaps to be decided." *Ibid. p.* 348.

16. " We invite you (the catholic clergy of England) to a temperate, a regular, a chriſtian reſiſtance. (to a biſhop.) *Addreſs to the catholic clergy. p.* 23.

17. " Of this church we believe the biſhop of Rome to be the *head*.... ſupreme in *diſcipline* by eccleſiaſtical inſtitution." *Appeal to the catholics of England. p.* 22.

*FINIS.*